

A Defence of Free Learning

LORD BEVERIDGE

Hon. Sec. of Academic Assistance Council 1933-8

*Vice-President of Society for the Protection of Science
and Learning 1938-44, and President since 1944*

LONDON

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

NEW YORK TORONTO

1959



27. NOV. 1959

Preface

THE DEFENCE OF FREE LEARNING set out in this book is practical defence, not argument for a cause that needs no argument. The book is an account, in the first place, of action taken by the universities and learned societies of Britain from 1933 onwards to help and to re-establish in useful human service university teachers and researchers expelled from such work in Germany by the tyrant Hitler, on grounds of political independence or race. As Hitler's example spread, the answer spread, to dealing with cases of similar persecution in Italy, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Spain, and Portugal. Soviet Russia also comes into the story of persecution of free thought, at various times in various ways.

This book is a contribution to history, not a political argument. It is the history of one class of human beings—scholars and their dependants—during twenty-five years of preparing for war, of waging war, and of doubtful recovery from war, in a world become attuned to violence. This period has been the subject of many histories and biographies, but none of them cover the subject of this present volume and few even mention it.

This book, moreover, is a history of what was done in one country only—Britain—to help one special class of human beings only—university teachers and scholars.

The attack on free learning which led to the action described here, as taken in Britain, led to answers in other countries also—Spain, France, U.S.A., and other parts of the New World. The British organizations which are the special subject of this book co-operated with agencies of like purpose in other lands. While no attempt is made to describe in detail the work of these agencies, enough is said to show the importance of this co-operation. And the British agencies naturally sought help from other countries, as they gave help where they could. The free world of learning proved itself one, against spreading tyranny and intolerance.

This book, finally, is concerned only with help needed by or given to a special class—university teachers and scholars. Such people were one section only of those who suffered from persecution on

grounds of race or political opinion. Academic refugees were part only of a general problem of refugees in the twenty-five years covered by this book. The agencies described here sought and received help from agencies of wider occupational scope, such as those set up by Jewish people, by the founders of the Stanley Baldwin Fund for Refugees, or, on the approach of World War II, by the British Government. Since the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, and indeed before then, Britain has had a practice of human treatment of refugees, a practice which did not fail between 1933 and 1958.

In numbers the men and women who are the subject of this volume are an insignificant proportion of all refugees in the period covered—2,600 against hundreds of thousands. Individually they are of outstanding importance. The Society for the Protection of Science and Learning was concerned not with feeding bodies but with keeping brains and spirits alive for human service, and finding for them the new environment suited to their needs, so that service might continue. Each person whom we helped or failed to help was an individual case different from any other. And happily their experience has been preserved not in official records only but in many personal letters. My story ranges from the world-famous scientists and scholars whom we saved to go on building science or illustrate the arts or social history, to such tragic failure as I had with Edith Speer, a brilliant administrator in the social field, whom I met when we were both thirty in Berlin and I had gone there to study labour exchanges and social insurance of which she was a master. She helped me then, but I failed to rescue her thirty years later, in 1939.

This book is a story of individual men and women who came before us and whom we tried to help. Most of them are still alive and have many personal contacts. For several reasons I have felt it both wise and courteous in most cases not to name them when giving their stories; I should not have felt justified in doing so without their consent in each case. This omission of names does not apply, of course, to Chapter 6 where the wandering scholars speak for themselves. It does not apply in other chapters, where the name seems essential or significant. And the account of what some of those not named are doing now, leaves it easy for those who will take the trouble to learn something of their past.

ARRANGEMENT OF THIS BOOK

The division of my total theme of twenty-five years into chapters presents problems of arrangement and chronology.

Chapter 1 tells how the attack launched by Hitler in March 1933 showed its character from 1935 on, as something meant to be permanent and something that spread to other countries. The answer followed. From the beginning, the founders of the Academic Assistance Council were ready to help university teachers, wherever their freedom was attacked. When it became clear that the attack would be lasting, the Council was converted into a Society framed to be lasting also. Chronologically, Chapter 1 runs from the spring of 1933 to the spring of 1936, when the Society for the Protection of Science and Learning was announced formally by the President, Lord Rutherford; but in this, as in other chapters, strict chronological order is abandoned where necessary for the sake of continuity in subject. In his announcement of 1936 Lord Rutherford forecast the title of this book, in naming as the purpose of the Society defence of free learning. But he added the words 'and science', making a distinction between science and learning which is ignored in my title.

Chapter 2, showing peace increasingly troubled, runs chronologically from April 1936 to September 1939. Its outstanding features are growth of the refugee problem in scale, as one League of Nations High Commissioner succeeded another, and growing recognition of the problem in Britain. In the first part of 1939, while the Stanley Baldwin Fund for Refugees generally was booming, the Society for the Protection of Science and Learning for the first time made a financially successful appeal for academic refugees.

Chapter 3 records fundamental changes made to our Society, as to others, by war. The final result was that, with full employment for its refugees as for others and with grants from taxation, the Society for the first time had more money than it needed to spend at once. But, of course, the value of money had fallen.

Chapter 4 presents World War II from a different standpoint—that of the refugee scholars themselves, describing in their own words the experiences of some of them under internment or deportation as enemy aliens.

Chapter 5 shows the old problems and evils of intolerance persisting in the new world brought into being by World War II.

Chapter 6, based on answers to a letter sent to all refugee scholars known to us, summarizes their experiences and resulting judgments.

Chapter 7 suggests briefly what tyrants have lost by their tyranny, and what free countries have gained in the brains and knowledge that could make a better world for all, if there were no tyrants lusting for more power. It ends with the moral of the book as a whole.

Finally there are placed on record in the Appendix some of the documents and other material which should be available to readers of this book, but should not be allowed to break the continuity of its story.

SOURCES OF THIS BOOK

The material used in writing this history consists in the main of documents collected for their work by the Council and Society. Since the Society is still in existence, some of these documents are still at 5 Old Burlington Street in the accommodation generously placed at our disposal by the Society for Visiting Scientists; they include all current minutes and reports and the register with addresses and particulars so far as known of the 2,600 scholars and scientists who came to our notice for possible help in displacement.

The great bulk of our documents could not be housed there, and till recently were stored for us in a synagogue in London. They were not available for study there and the synagogue could not keep them indefinitely; they were threatened with eviction at the end of May last. Happily and promptly the Bodleian Library came to the rescue of the documents and my work. They are housed now in an ample quiet room there, and with every conceivable facility for examination by myself and assistants. They include, in addition to minutes, accounts, and official papers of all kinds, masses of correspondence concerning individuals, far more than I can use for this short book. Our examination, however, can and should have the effect of helping possible future users of this material, wherever it may be kept ultimately.

In addition to the documents of the Council and Society, there are many letters and documents relevant to the subject of this book in personal files of my own. There are the other general resources of Parliamentary proceedings, the Press, and biographies.

In the twenty-five years since the Academic Assistance Council started, we and the world have lost many of our leading spirits,

including Lord Rutherford, our first President; William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury, our second President; Sir Frederic Kenyon, generally in the chair of our Executive Committee in the early years and ending as Vice-President in 1952; Professor Major Greenwood, our Honorary Treasurer from 1933 to the end of 1949; Sir John Clapham, Chairman of the Cambridge Allocation Committee in the war years; and Professor C. S. Gibson, the effective Honorary Secretary from our first meeting till he retired, late in 1945.

Three others who were pillars of our work throughout are happily still active. Walter Adams, appointed our first paid Secretary in 1933, left this post to become Secretary of the London School of Economics five years later, but continued as Honorary Secretary and almost unfailing attendant at all executive meetings, till his departure in 1955 to become head of University College of Rhodesia and Nyasaland. Professor A. V. Hill, holding one active position after another from the beginning, formally becoming Chairman of our Executive Committee in 1946, has never been absent from our counsels or failed to undertake any exceptional task that came along. Miss Esther Simpson, coming to us as Assistant Secretary in 1933, became Secretary in 1939, and, in her present post of Assistant Secretary to the Society of Visiting Scientists, she continues as our indispensable Secretary also.

Each of these three has read the manuscript of this book at one stage or another, and has made invaluable comments and suggestions—above all the last two, who were always at my beck and call. I alone must take responsibility for every opinion in this book, for everything in it, indeed, that is not a direct quotation. But I have drawn relentlessly on A. V. Hill and Esther Simpson and they have been tireless in response.

I am happy to make a number of other acknowledgements of varied help.

Dr. Leo Liepmann wrote specially for me his fascinating account of experiences as internee, Professor H. W. Arndt allowed me to print as much as I wanted of the diary of his journey to Canada on deportation; Dr. Glücksmann allowed me to print his account of experience as a deportee in Canada.

These three contributions appear in Chapter 4.

My friend and former secretary Enid Chambers helped in the sending out of the circular letters of inquiry which are the basis of

Chapter 6, and my stepdaughter Elspeth Burn helped largely in analysing the answers received. Needless to say, the making of this chapter threw additional burdens on Esther Simpson both in the sending out of the circular and in checking the results. Elspeth Burn undertook also the important and difficult task of making the Index.

Collection and examination of material for this history cost naturally a little money, though most of this work was done, as most of the work of the Council and Society had been done, for love of it and of the cause they served. It was an added delight to all concerned in the making of the book, that all the unavoidable expenses incurred were met from grants which we had made to two displaced teachers. Professor R. Fürth, originally from Czechoslovakia, till recently Reader in Physics at Birkbeck College, London, and Professor Guido Pontecorvo, originally from the Italian Ministry of Agriculture, now Professor of Genetics in the University of Glasgow, found themselves so well established in their new careers that they offered our grants back to us. When they heard of the making of this book they gave us at once liberty to use their money for its expenses.

It is a pleasure to thank Mrs. Flecker and Messrs. Heinemann for allowing me to print in the dedication of this book two stanzas from *Hassan*, so beautiful in themselves and so fitting to my theme.

It is a pleasure also to thank Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton, with whom I have had many happy relations in the past, for allowing me to use as freely as I liked in Chapter 1 what I had written and published through them in my book on *Power and Influence*, and to thank Messrs. Alfred A. Knopf Inc. as publishers of *Hassan* in the United States for permission to use in American publication the two stanzas printed in my dedication.

I end this Preface with a verbal explanation. The organization whose history occupies most of this book was and is the Society for the Protection of Science and Learning; in the title of the book I have treated Learning as including Science. So in some of our documents, including the first document of all—that of May 22, 1933—we mention both 'scholars' and 'scientists', as if they were distinct from one another; in this book the terms 'scholars' and 'refugee scholars' include men of natural science, unless the contrary is indicated.

Contents

PREFACE

1. ATTACK AND ANSWER. 1933-6	1
1. Hitler Strikes and Free Learning Answers	1
2. Academic Assistance Council (A.A.C.) at Work	8
3. Learning and War	22
4. A.A.C. becomes Society for the Protection of Science and Learning (S.P.S.L.)	24
2. THE SOCIETY AT WORK IN TROUBLED PEACE. 1936-9	27
1. Spreading of Persecution	27
2. The Cases we Helped	33
3. Some Cases we could not Help	40
4. Special Tasks of Troubled Peace	44
5. The Heidelberg Celebration of 1936	48
3. THE SOCIETY AT WORK IN WORLD WAR II. 1939-45	51
1. Four Immediate Changes through War	51
2. General Internment of May 1940	55
3. Practical Help to Individuals Continues	62
4. SOME EXPERIENCES OF REFUGEE SCHOLARS IN 1940	69
1. A Quaker in the Isle of Man	70
2. A Sociologist on the Way to Canada	79
3. An Anatomist in Canada	86
5. A NEW WORLD AND OLD PROBLEMS. 1945-58	91
6. WANDERING SCHOLARS	102
1. The Making of this Chapter	102
2. The Scholars Travel	103
3. The Scholars Speak their Thanks	110
4. The Scholars Put their Difficulties	114
5. Choice between Old and New Countries	119
7. FOLLY OF TYRANTS	122

Appendix

1. Note on American Experience with Academic Refugees	126
2. Note on Emergency Society of German Scholars Abroad (<i>Notgemeinschaft</i>)	128
3. Memorandum on Formation of S.P.S.L.	129
4. Meetings and Lectures for Appeal of February 1939	132
5. Circular Letter of June 1958 to Scholars on S.P.S.L. Register	134

Statistical Tables

Table 1. Subjects and Countries of Origin of Refugees before Allocation Committee in 1940 and 1942	66
Table 2. Countries of Origin and Present Countries of Displaced Scholars	105
INDEX	137

1. Attack and Answer. 1933-6

1. Hitler Strikes and Free Learning Answers

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AGO, on an evening at the end of March 1933, I was enjoying myself with friends at a café in Vienna; the friends included the Austrian economist Ludwig von Mises and Lionel Robbins of the London School of Economics and his wife. As we talked of things in general, an evening paper was brought in giving the names of a dozen leading professors in German universities who were being dismissed by the new Nazi régime on racial or political grounds. As Mises read out the names to our growing indignation, Robbins and I decided that we would take action in the London School of Economics to help scholars in our subjects who should come under Hitler's ban. I posted the newspaper cutting at once to the Secretary of the School, now my wife, so that she might prepare for what was afoot.

On my way home from Vienna in April, I had my first intimation of what terror may mean to the individual when justice has become the will of a sadistic tyrant. There travelled with me in the train to Frankfurt a German professor slightly known to me, not one of those already listed for dismissal but one who might be on a new list. He was in a state of panic all the way because in the next compartment was a youth, little more than a boy, whom he took for a Nazi agent, detailed to keep watch on him and hand him to the police. My friend's fears may have been imaginary, but his panic was real, and mind- and spirit-destroying.¹

At the School of Economics, action to answer Hitler came as soon as we reassembled after Easter. The Professorial Council, after two discussions by a special committee, agreed on May 17 that all teachers and administrators in the School should be invited to contribute, by deduction from salaries, to an Academic Assistance Fund for helping displaced scholars in economics and political science; they aimed at raising £1,000 a year, and not much short of this was collected in the three years for which the School fund kept its

¹ This is a quotation from my book on *Power and Influence*, p. 235, where I gave my first description of the incident and of the Academic Assistance Council.



separate existence. The Professorial Council welcomed the proposal which, as Director, I had put before the Governors, for inviting displaced teachers of special distinction to strengthen the post-graduate side of the School. But they realized that such action by the Governors must be limited to top-notchers. They wanted their own fund as a means, at need, of helping also younger men and women.

The answer to Hitler in British universities generally was as immediate and as emphatic as the answer of the School of Economics. Before I went abroad in March I had arranged to stay with George and Janet Trevelyan in Cambridge for the last week-end of April. When this time approached, I found that it coincided with the day fixed by the School of Economics students for their Sports, a festival that, if possible, I never failed to attend. So I begged Janet Trevelyan to let me come instead at the week-end after, May 6 to 8, 1933. I warned her that I should want to talk with George and her and others about displaced German professors. I lived up to the warning and talked about nothing else.

In that week-end the Academic Assistance Council of the future was conceived, in discussion largely with George Trevelyan, Frederick Gowland Hopkins, and Lord Rutherford. Most important of all, I persuaded Rutherford, after a first refusal on the ground that he was up to the eyes in other work and against strong opposition by Lady Rutherford, to become President of the Council. I was helped in this by the long friendship between his family and the family of my Janet, now Lady Beveridge, who came with me to our second talk.¹ But in the end it was our cause rather than our friendship that brought him over. As we talked, he exploded with wrath at Hitler's treatment of scientific colleagues whom he knew intimately and valued. He would have been miserable not to be with us if we went ahead. He did everything and more to make our going ahead possible.

With Rutherford as our President-to-be, going ahead was easy. I polished our week-end Memorandum and Appeal for establishing an Academic Assistance Council, began collecting sponsors to sign it, and sent it to the Royal Society in draft. Almost at once, on

¹ See *Power and Influence*, pp. 236-7, and my note contributed to the biography of Lord Rutherford by Professor A. S. Eve, pp. 276-377. In the first of these I describe the support to my plea given through family friendship by the present Lady Beveridge and in the second I mention Rutherford's influence in obtaining for our work Professor C. S. Gibson as an honorary secretary.

May 11th, I had an answer from the President: 'The Royal Society Council today agreed that the Society should do all that you wish in connexion with the appeal, with the reservation only that they may see the final form of the document before it goes out.'

In the first draft and in one that followed it on May 16, I left an important gap—the names of the honorary secretaries-to-be. On May 18 I came down to discussing persons. 'It is, I think, essential that one at least of the named honorary secretaries should be in a position to give a substantial amount of time to the work . . . as neither I nor Professor Greenwood are.' I suggested, as one able to give time and be honorary secretary with myself, a distinguished Jewish professor. The Royal Society's answer to me was unequivocal. 'They were strongly of opinion that no signatory of the Appeal, and particularly that neither of the honorary secretaries should be of Jewish origin. . . . Naturally, Council had little time to consider who might act with you as Honorary Secretary, but the name of Professor C. S. Gibson was mentioned.'

Today I am sure that the Council of the Royal Society were right and I was wrong on the point where they differed from me particularly, as to the position of Honorary Secretary. They were still more right, if rightness can have degrees, in the alternative that they suggested—C. S. Gibson of the Chemistry Department at Guy's Hospital, the best colleague any man could pray for.

As to the signatories of our appeal, to whom also the Royal Society made reference, they had been collected as men of academic standing and interest, without a thought of racial origins. So far as I know, of the forty-one signatories, only Samuel Alexander was definitely Jewish, but his twenty-eight years as Professor of Philosophy and the loving esteem in which he was held by all who knew him, to say nothing of his academic honours and Order of Merit, would have made objection to him absurd. There was another signatory—Arthur Schuster, born in Frankfurt-am-Main, whom, on his name alone, Hitler might have treated as non-Aryan, but Schuster, besides being a Fellow of the Royal Society, had been its Secretary for seven years. We felt safe in going ahead with our forty-one signatories, and we never failed to receive the maximum of help from the Royal Society.

On May 24th the birth of the Academic Assistance Council was announced in all the papers of Britain, with a list of forty-three signatories as impressive as any such list could be, with President

and Honorary Secretaries complete, and with the Rooms of the Royal Society in Burlington House as its address. I print this historic document below.

ACADEMIC ASSISTANCE COUNCIL

Rooms of The Royal Society,
Burlington House,
LONDON, W.1.
May 22, 1933.

Many eminent scholars and men of science and University teachers of all grades and in all faculties are being obliged to relinquish their posts in the Universities of Germany.

The Universities of our own and other countries will, we hope, take whatever action they can to offer employment to these men and women, as teachers and investigators. But the financial resources of Universities are limited and are subject to claims for their normal development which cannot be ignored. If the information before us is correct, effective help from outside for more than a small fraction of the teachers now likely to be condemned to want and idleness will depend on the existence of large funds specifically devoted to this purpose. It seems clear also that some organisation will be needed to act as a centre of information and put the teachers concerned into touch with the institutions that can best help them.

We have formed ourselves accordingly into a provisional Council for these two reasons. We shall seek to raise a fund, to be used primarily, though not exclusively, in providing maintenance for displaced teachers and investigators, and finding them the chance of work in Universities and scientific institutions.

We shall place ourselves in communication both with Universities in this country and with organisations which are being formed for similar purposes in other countries, and we shall seek to provide a clearing house and centre of information for those who can take any kind of action directed to the same end. We welcome offers of co-operation from all quarters. We appeal for generous help from all who are concerned for academic freedom and the security of learning. We ask for means to prevent the waste of exceptional abilities exceptionally trained.

The issue raised at the moment is not a Jewish one alone; many who have suffered or are threatened have no Jewish connection. The issue, though raised acutely at the moment in Germany, is not confined to that country. We should like to regard any funds entrusted to us as available for University teachers and investigators of whatever country who, on

grounds of religion, political opinion or race are unable to carry on their work in their own country.

The Royal Society have placed office accommodation at the disposal of the Council. Sir William Beveridge and Professor C. S. Gibson, F.R.S., are acting as Hon. Secretaries of the Council, and communications should be sent to them at the Royal Society, Burlington House, W.1. An Executive Committee is being formed and the names of Trustees for the Fund will shortly be announced. In the meantime cheques can be sent to either of the Hon. Secretaries.

Our action implies no unfriendly feelings to the people of any country; it implies no judgment on forms of government or on any political issue between countries. Our only aims are the relief of suffering and the defence of learning and science.

LASCELLES ABERCROMBIE

S. ALEXANDER

W. H. BEVERIDGE

W. H. BRAGG

BUCKMASTER

CECIL

CRAWFORD AND BALCARRES

WINIFRED C. CULLIS

H. A. L. FISHER

MARGERY FRY

C. S. GIBSON

M. GREENWOOD

J. S. HALDANE

A. V. HILL

GEORGE F. HILL

W. S. HOLDSWORTH

F. GOWLAND HOPKINS

A. E. HOUSMAN

J. C. IRVINE

F. G. KENYON

J. M. KEYNES

A. D. LINDSAY

LYTTON

J. W. MACKAIL

ALLEN MAWER

GILBERT MURRAY

EUSTACE PERCY

W. J. POPE

ROBERT S. RAIT

RAYLEIGH

CHARLES GRANT ROBERTSON

ROBERT ROBINSON

RUTHERFORD

MICHAEL S. SADLER

ARTHUR SCHUSTER

C. S. SHERRINGTON

GEORGE ADAM SMITH

G. ELLIOT SMITH

J. C. STAMP

J. J. THOMSON

G. M. TREVELYAN

On the day after this document was published, my letters out on May 25 show as the first people who sent cheques to me on May 24 Maynard Keynes, Michael Sadler, then Master of University College, Oxford, and Emrys Evans, Principal of the University of Wales—all by first post.

The first meeting of the Council was held on June 1st, 1933, in the rooms of the Royal Society at Burlington House; Gowland Hopkins had helped us to this. I began proceedings, according to

the Minutes, by a financial statement. We had raised already something like £10,000; we should want more but we had made an encouraging beginning. C. S. Gibson broke in to say that my statement left out something: that I had paid personally the expenses of calling the A.A.C. into being. As effective Honorary Secretary (I return to this in a moment), Gibson made certain that what he said was recorded in the Minutes. Any expenditure of mine in the launching of the A.A.C. must have been trifling. What was not trifling in this incident was the light that it threw on my colleagues-to-be in our common task, as delightful as friends as they were tireless in their work.

At this meeting, or just after, we made three vital additions to our strength, in addition to Gibson, marked as Honorary Secretary with me. We acquired A. V. Hill and Frederic Kenyon as Vice-Presidents of the Council. We lured Walter Adams¹ from safe pensionable lecturing at University College, London, to be our full-time Secretary—to work harder for the same salary without pension or prospects. When Adams left his salaried post with us in August 1938 to become Secretary to the London School of Economics, we made sure of not losing him. By pushing me up to be Vice-President, place was found for Adams as an Honorary Secretary with Gibson. To our Vice-Presidents and Secretaries, honorary or paid, we added before long an Honorary Treasurer in Professor Major Greenwood of the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine. All these five names—Gibson, Hill, Kenyon, Greenwood, and Adams, as well as Rutherford—will come again and again into the story of how free learning was defended in Britain. One other name, that of Esther Simpson, starting from near the beginning in the modest role of Assistant Secretary, proved to be of lasting and growing importance; for nineteen of the twenty-five years recorded in this volume she has been the Secretary, central to our daily administration.

Rapid answer to Hitler's attack on free learning was not confined to Britain. In the United States an Emergency Committee in aid of Displaced German Scholars was established under the leadership of Dr. Stephen Duggan, in the same month as saw the establishment of the Academic Assistance Council here. The problems in the

¹ Now Principal of the University College of Rhodesia and Nyasaland. His appointment with the A.A.C. began on July 1, 1933.

States were in some ways even greater than ours in Britain, for the great depression had left most American universities in a weak financial position. The Emergency Committee started on the basis of having to find for itself, by appeals to foundations or otherwise, all the money required to make employment of refugees possible; it felt at first unable to look to the universities for salaries at all. It ended its work with the end of the war in 1945, and published in 1948 a report on its activities entitled *The Rescue of Science and Learning*, written by Stephen Duggan and Betty Drury.¹

There was set up also from the beginning a German organization for rescue of displaced scholars, known as the *Notgemeinschaft Deutscher Wissenschaftler im Ausland*; this may be translated as 'Emergency Society of German Scholars Abroad'. Established at first in Zürich, at the beginning of 1936, it moved to England for closer contact with the Society for Protection of Science and Learning. There resulted continuous collaboration, with our Society giving office accommodation to the *Notgemeinschaft*, while the latter, through its chairman Dr. Fritz Demuth, who had been Administrator of the College of Commerce in Berlin, placed its information and its contacts at our disposal; both were of great value. In doing this Dr. Demuth by no means confined himself to assisting scholars from Germany; we owed to him the placing of some Spanish scholars in South America.

There were several other agencies of similar purpose. But the American Emergency Committee and the German *Notgemeinschaft* are of special interest. Notes on each of them are printed in the Appendix at the end of this volume.²

The outstanding feature of British experience was the spontaneous rising of our universities and of those who worked and lived there, in defence of free learning against Hitler's attack. This meant that the Academic Assistance Council (described in future as the A.A.C.), in dealing with our universities, knocked from the beginning at an open door. Its function became as much that of a specialized labour exchange, putting displaced scholars into contact with universities eager to employ them, as a function of income provider.

¹ Macmillan Company, New York.

² More is said of these two agencies and of others with whom our Society co-operated both in our Fourth Report of 1938 (pp. 8 and 9) and by Norman Bentwich in his book on *The Rescue and Achievement of Refugee Scholars*, published in 1953 by Martinus Nijhoff of The Hague, Netherlands.

We started knocking at the door of universities by a letter sent on June 16, 1933, to each Vice-Chancellor, over the signatures of Gibson and myself, as honorary secretaries.

It is contemplated that the main, though not the only, form of expenditure to be incurred by the Council should be in the provision of a part or the whole of the maintenance for displaced scholars and scientists for whom a chance of continuing their work is open in institutions of learning in this country. With this in view we are forming as complete and detailed a register as possible of those who are likely to be displaced and in need of immediate assistance of this kind.

We asked each university to say if it could find vacancies for any of the men so registered, to be selected finally by the university, and if so, on what financial terms. Could the whole or any part of the maintenance required be provided by the university itself or by funds under its control, or must the whole be found by the Academic Assistance Council? 'You will realise that though the Council has funds in prospect, these are not likely to be adequate unless they can be augmented.'

Whatever might be done by particular universities or in the way of local funds, some money in its own control was essential to the A.A.C. Some central body had to be in a position to ease financially acceptance by a university of a particular scientist or scholar. So from time to time general appeals for funds were necessary. And they showed at once the spirit of British universities.

Our first general appeal came less than two years from the beginning, in March 1935. It was accompanied by a letter signed by the Chancellors of eight British universities: Stanley Baldwin, Crewe, Cecil, Halifax, Winston Churchill, Londonderry, Crawford and Balcarres, and Meston. They signed, of course, in their private capacities as members of the university world, not officially as Chancellors. But they could not have signed if they had any doubt of university feeling.

2. Academic Assistance Council (A.A.C.) at Work

At the launching of the A.A.C., I had felt bound to make clear that I could not give to it all the time that should come from one at least of the honorary secretaries. I had a full job as Director of the London School of Economics, and other work which could not be refused came upon me from the Government—Chairmanship of

the new Unemployment Insurance Statutory Committee in 1934 and Chairmanship in 1936 of a Committee to plan Food Rationing for the next war. In the contribution which I made to Lord Rutherford's biography, published in 1939, I described C. S. Gibson as the effective Honorary Secretary. In the short account of the Council that I gave in *Power and Influence* five years ago, I said that from the beginning the detailed work of the Council was done by others than myself. I spoke also of the deep impression which my colleagues from the natural sciences made upon me at that time. 'Not only were they ready to give an indefinite amount of time to the task of considering cases for assistance, but they began by knowing all about the work and worth of their fellow scientists in all countries.' They showed their study and themselves as truly international.¹

All that I wrote in *Power and Influence* about the A.A.C. and its successor was true. But in writing I expressed also the hope that some day someone would give a full account of our answer to the Nazi attack on freedom of thought and teaching and study. Now that I have undertaken this account myself, with recourse to all the records, I have been surprised at times by discovering the number of things that I did or attempted for our common cause. I could no more be kept away from defence of free learning than Rutherford could be kept away, however little time we had for it.

To begin with, I did undertake one piece of current administration. I became Chairman of one of the Council's most laborious organs, the Allocation Committee, deciding just what help to give or not to give in individual cases, and I remained there till the outbreak of World War II. Chairmanship of this Committee had the advantage to me, as future historian of academic assistance, of bringing to light the infinitely varied human problems which persecution caused in the academic field.

Apart from this regular committee work, I used all the contacts which my varied life had given me: with the Press and the B.B.C.,

¹ *Power and Influence*, ch. xi, 'Fading of Dreams', pp. 234-9. The one thing that today I regret not having included in this brief account five years ago is equal recognition of internationalism and devotion to their task of rescue in my colleagues in the field of Arts, notably Sir Frederic Kenyon and Sir John Clapham. In the end, the number of academic refugees for whom the A.A.C. and its successor—Society for the Protection of Science and Learning—did something, was divided about equally between Science (including medicine and engineering) and Arts (including law, history, economics, and political science).

with Ministers, Civil Servants, and business men, with Foundations which might give us money. And I exploited the tastes which I had acquired for writing and for talking in public.

One of the earliest of these talking occasions was a famous meeting at the Royal Albert Hall, addressed by Einstein on October 3, 1933. Limiting ourselves, as we of the A.A.C. did, to helping university teachers, we had realized from the first the need to co-operate with those in neighbouring fields. We had joined in forming a German Refugees Assistance Fund (Academic and Professional) based on four co-operating bodies—ourselves, the International Student Service, the Refugee Professionals Committee (concerned with lawyers, doctors, non-university teachers, and so on), and a Germany Emergency Committee of the Society of Friends. These four bodies between them organized an Albert Hall meeting for Einstein and he made, to a packed audience of 10,000, a speech impressive in itself, and all the more significant as his first public address in the English language. He announced himself as a good European and a Jew. He ended by stressing the differences between the time of his youth and now. 'I am no longer young and can, therefore, say, that as a child and as a young man I experienced that phase—when a young man thinks only about the trivialities of personal existence and talks like his fellows. Only with difficulty can one see what is really behind such a conventional mask. . . . How different it is today! In the lightning flashes of our tempestuous times, one sees human beings and things in their nakedness.'

In a string of eight others, from Rutherford to Austen Chamberlain and Maude Royden, I had to speak out of my turn, in order that I might rush off to the B.B.C. to tell there what had been said.

In addressing meetings my main efforts, after the Einstein gathering, were in 1935: at Newcastle, in support of an Academic Assistance Committee for Northumberland and Durham; at Oxford, with Frederic Kenyon and Gilbert Murray, under the Chairmanship of H. A. L. Fisher; in London to the Association of University Teachers; in Birmingham, where I addressed no less than three gatherings on a crowded Sunday and Monday. I began with a sermon at the Sunday morning service of October 13, 1935, in Carrs Lane Church. I went on to a statement from the chancel steps of the Parish Church at its evening service. I ended with a luncheon hour address to the Rotary Club on October 14.

Nothing more need be said of most of these affairs. I was covering

familiar ground from a familiar platform. But the Carrs Lane sermon seems worth putting on record now, as a picture of events and feelings then.

The Academic Assistance Council was conceived as a temporary body. We could not believe that the persecution would endure. It is continuing and being intensified.

I know personally men who are active members of a Christian Church, not themselves Jews at all, but falling under the ban because their grandfather or grandmother had some Jewish blood.

I know personally men whose ancestors have been honoured and respected citizens of Germany for generations—men whose fathers fell in the World War—who now will starve or live on charity in Germany if they cannot get help here.

I know of older men who themselves fought for Germany in the War and gave distinguished service since—who are in the same plight.

I know of others who had made up their minds to struggle on in Germany—giving up hope for their own lives. But now they realize that their children's lives also are without hope. The Schools, the Universities, all liberal professions will be shut to them. These parents are wanting to come out of Germany for their children's sake. They may have resources in Germany, to make a fresh start. If they come out, they can bring with them 10 marks, 15 shillings. That may sound incredible, but it is true.

Learning, freedom, brotherhood are not as safe as we had dreamed they were. They need our continuing help and sacrifice.

The world is darker than we had thought. Shadows of brutality and ignorance returning from the past lie across the world. The shadow does not lie on Germany alone. But the shadow looks deepest on Germany because in Germany before there was most light. The German people have been one of the great civilizing forces of the world.

Let me tell you one more thing that may seem incredible. I went the other day to a cinema and saw a German film—a picture of student life in the Conservatoire, the School of Music, in Dresden. It was one of the most perfect things that I have ever seen on the screen, well-designed, well-acted, full of beauty of light and shade and sound, of youth and love and good-will, of that love and understanding of music in which German people are supreme.

There is still love of music welling up in German hearts, old and young. There is genius which I hope will produce for us fresh marvels of sound and speech.

But do not be deceived by pictures and hopes. It may be incredible that these artistic perfections should live side by side with the cruelties which I have described to you. It may be incredible, but it is true. There are things today all over Germany as lovely as music and youth and

human affections can ever be, but there are also things so ugly and savage that we thought that mankind had put them away three hundred years ago. We can only ask: What has gone wrong with this great and gifted people?

But we must do more than ask questions. What is happening in Germany today is a challenge to two great civilizing principles, of science and religion. It denies free movement of the spirit in pursuit of truth in every field; it denies free movement of the spirit in the common worship of God; it denies brotherhood of man and loving-kindness to the young—the great messages given to all of us 1900 years ago.

What is happening in Germany today is a challenge to us in Britain above all. It is a challenge not to be taken up by protests. Protests butter no parsnips. It is a challenge given by deeds, not words—and must be met not by words, but by deeds. It is a challenge given by deeds of hate; it should be met by deeds of charity.

Like every challenge, it is an opportunity. If we ignore the challenge, we shall have left it on record that to us humanity, learning, science, spiritual freedom are not worth an effort. If we take up the challenge—in proportion as we take it up—if the action of Germany is met by a swelling tide of help throughout the world—we shall turn a black page of world history into a bright one.

The notes which I prepared for this sermon contained an extract from *The Times* of October 10, 1935, setting out the by-laws of Gunzenhausen in Franconia. My recollection today is that I did not use this extract at Carrs Lane. But it is worth printing here to show the depths which Nazi persecution had reached even before the end of 1935.

BY-LAWS OF GUNZENHAUSEN¹

Although the publication of the regulations applying the Nuremberg anti-Jewish laws has been repeatedly postponed, on account of the many difficulties which mature consideration of those hastily drafted measures has disclosed, the economic isolation of the Jewish community is being rapidly pushed forward by local authorities.

The settlement of Jews in Gunzenhausen is prohibited. Municipal house and land property may no longer be sold to Jews. Businessmen, artisans, and others who in future maintain business relations with Jews will no longer be considered in the allotment of municipal contracts. They need also not expect any consideration in such matters as tax abatements or permission to pay taxes by instalments. Receivers of

¹ *The Times*, October 10th, 1935.

municipal poor relief or persons in need of relief are forbidden to use Jewish shops or employ Jewish physicians or lawyers 'if they want to remain in the enjoyment of public assistance'. Jews are no longer permitted to use the public swimming and other baths.

With the Government we had a friendly contact through Sir John Simon as Home Secretary—the most important Minister for our purpose. He took an interest in the Academic Assistance Council from its beginning, and in December 1935 acted on suggestions made to him by us: that the conditions on which a number of scholars and scientists from Germany had been allowed to land originally should be relaxed for them and their families in a number of cases that we put to him. Our list of such people included some very distinguished names indeed, among the most valued additions today that the free world owes to Hitler.

With the Press we had the best of all possible contacts through Geoffrey Dawson, with his Oxford connection. We never failed to tell him in advance when we wanted special publicity and we never failed to get it. An article by Rutherford after our first year's work called forth a long leader on Wandering Scholars. Each successive report that the A.A.C. made, usually with an appeal for more help, was treated royally. Of course we had many other admirable friends in the Press and we never failed to call on their help.

We found the other main organ of publicity—the B.B.C.—polite but slightly guarded. Reith gave us a special chance on the Einstein meeting, naturally. But I remember one occasion at least when, having received a negative reply from Reith to our request for a special boost of our Oxford meeting of 1935, I told Walter Adams that he must now get at John Coatman, an even older friend of mine in the B.B.C.

Our two most urgent needs at the outset appeared to be money to keep going and collaboration with others working on the same problem. I was on very friendly terms at that moment with the Rockefeller Foundation. They seemed to me the ideal persons to provide, on both sides of the Atlantic, the financial side of the answer to Hitler's attack, and to establish the international office that would be needed. So on May 25, 1933, the day after the A.A.C. had been announced, I wrote to Edmund Day of the Rockefeller Foundation a long letter inviting the interest of the Foundation in displaced German scholars and scientists, and suggesting as a first step the setting up, at the cost of the Foundation, of an international

office for bringing together the various organizations in different countries that might set out to help such academics.

The Foundation did not rise to this fly, or to one or two other specific proposals which we made to them later for enabling us as a council to organize work for refugees. But they did at once set aside funds for helping universities to employ displaced teachers of special distinction and they approved a letter which we might send to all British universities calling attention to this; it was to be a condition of help from the Foundation that an appreciable contribution towards the expenditure involved should come from some other source, whether the university itself, the A.A.C., or by funds raised specially. Before the end of 1934 we had a list of 40 distinguished refugee scholars receiving partial or full grants from the Foundation, 31 in England and 9 in Europe. This kind of help by the Rockefeller Foundation continued on an increasing scale and with developments to meet changing war conditions till the end of 1945.¹

Another great transatlantic Foundation to which also we made an immediate approach, the Carnegie Corporation of the British Empire, came in the end to adopting a programme on broadly the same lines. They provided fellowships for displaced scholars and scientists of sufficient distinction, making two variations from the Rockefeller Foundation plan. On the one hand, they did not require money from other sources to match their grants. On the other hand, they limited their fellowships to universities and similar institutions in the British Empire. We were disappointed to find that the British Empire did not include Palestine, with its Hebrew University.

The Carnegie Corporation and the Rockefeller Foundation alike refused requests put to them jointly by the American Emergency Committee and ourselves, that, instead of confining their help to scholars of established eminence, they should provide some junior fellowships for younger refugees of promise; we had many such on our books.

¹ I have had the pleasure and interest of looking through the Annual Reports of the Rockefeller Foundation from 1933 to 1958, kindly sent to me in England. From 1933 to 1945, when the programme for European refugee scholars ended, the Foundation spent a total of \$1,410,778 in aiding 303 individual scholars, the majority of whom settled in America. During the same years, the Foundation appropriated on an average more than \$10,000,000 each year to the advancement of knowledge. The striking action taken by the Foundation in 1956 for aiding Hungarian refugee scholars is noted on p. 124 below.

Neither of these Foundation schemes helped us to solve our own financial problems, or to feel sure of being able to carry on. With other possible sources of large sums we had even less success. In the first quarter of 1934 on behalf of the A.A.C. I tried the Pilgrim Trust through my old friend Tom Jones, but we were turned down in April 1934. We tried the Bernhard Baron Trust much earlier, through Israel Sieff and Lord Reading, in a letter signed by Lord Rutherford, but with no success. Early in 1935 I attacked simultaneously and in vain the bankers and the National Union of Teachers.

The bankers were suggested to me by my friend H. H. Joachim, after the Oxford meeting of March 1935. The colleges, said Joachim, have no money to spare; he suggested trying the big banks to promise each £150 a year for three years. I did the best I could, through Max Bonn, Favill Tuke of Barclays, and Peacock of the Bank of England, with sympathy from Josiah Stamp, but the answer was definitely no.

The National Union of Teachers I tried first by an interview in March 1935 with the Secretary, F. Mander. He told me that Halifax had great influence with his members. So I got Halifax's blessing, but a negative came from the N.U.T. in April 1935.

Defence of refugees against tyrants made no general appeal before the spread of Hitlerism over western Europe in 1938. For the first six years from our beginning to the spring of 1939 we lived from hand to mouth. Our stand-by from first to last was the universities and their staffs. But we received also large sums from special sources like Imperial Chemical Industries, and a grant of £2,500 a year for several years from the Central Fund for British Jewry. In the Jewish community we had very good friends. Two in particular with whom I was in constant touch from the beginning were Sir Robert Waley Cohen and Israel Sieff; from them came not only large personal gifts but a call on the Central Jewish Fund.

To set against our disappointments with foundations, bankers, and others who might have given large sums, we got money at times from unexpected sources.

The pleasantest and most encouraging of these was the Displaced Scholars Fund, consisting of money contributed by refugees whom we had established already in Britain. A leading part in starting the fund was taken by the late Dr. F. Saxl of the Warburg Institute whose transfer from Hamburg to Britain is described on

pages 20-21. In our first financial year we received £4,000 from this source. And this help continued.

On another occasion we found ourselves unexpectedly richer by £25 because a distinguished Oxonian was held in his reminiscences to have libelled another Oxonian. The latter extracted £25 in place of damages from the publishers, and offered it to the Academic Assistance Council. After studying the publishers' letter explaining the money, our Executive decided that we could accept it.

We may have been the more ready to take this Oxford money because we had not been able to send a letter of appeal to Oxford graduates, similar to one which had just brought in about £3,000 from graduates of London and Cambridge. For whatever reason, the addresses of Oxford graduates were less accessible to us twenty-odd years ago than the addresses of those who had studied elsewhere.

Though money for our academic refugees never came easily, money for other purposes at times came pouring over us.

In the spring of 1934, for instance, A. V. Hill received a proposal from an American, with wealth behind him, to found a Society for making it easier for scientists in different countries to share information as to their work. Hill did not think such a Society necessary and said so in a letter to his American friend. Scientists in each subject, he explained, found no difficulty in discovering what scientists in other countries but with the same subject were doing: what was needed was an organization to stand for the integrity, the independence, and the universality of science and learning, with money behind it. When Hill showed me his letter to the American I described it as admirable and added: 'I feel that one of the needs of the world is an organization for diverting lunatic money into sane channels.' The American's answer to Hill was a cable: 'Advice accepted completely. Sending tentative plans within twenty days.' Hill, in telling me of this, claimed to be the first fellow of my new Society; he signed his letter to me with F.S.D.L.M.S.C. after the name.

Two years later, in 1936, I received a letter from a man just returned from South Africa, saying that he had obtained there conditional promises of £10,000 for research into the causes of anti-Semitism, as a part of the whole question of persecution. In the same letter—he was an English schoolmaster, not a South African—he called attention to the fact that 1936 was the bicentenary of

abolition in Britain of laws against witchcraft; he urged that there should be public celebrations of this, as background 'to the present fight against the forces of darkness'. As this letter suggests, its writer—Geoffrey Pyke by name—was an enthusiast bursting with ideas in many different fields. As one concerned with the management of schools, he had the original idea, for his times, that one could not make a first-rate school without paying extremely high salaries to the teachers. As a practical scientist he had in World War II an idea for war that brought him directly to the notice of our war leader and made him one of the very few people who appear both in this book of mine and in *The Second World War* by Sir Winston Churchill.

He was author of a war device named Habakkuk, for creating a floating airfield on which fighter aircraft might refuel at sea at any chosen point. The airfield was to be made of ice stiffened by a mixture of wood pulp, to delay melting. This mixture was called Pykrete after its inventor.

Pykrete appears in Volume V, Chapter IV, of *The Second World War* twice over: as one of the problems occupying its author's mind in August 1943 as he journeyed westwards on the *Queen Mary*, and again when a practical experiment was made on it in Quebec by inviting a muscular General to attack it with a chopper. The General split a large block of ice with one blow, but chopping at Pykrete merely jarred his elbow. Pyke's idea appealed greatly to Lord Mountbatten, and much development work was done on it in Canada on the Great Lakes, but in the end it had no success.

When in October 1935 I delivered three speeches for our cause in Birmingham, I made a virtue of necessity and said that our strength lay in small subscriptions meaning wide support: 'Whatever you give is valuable. Whatever you give will be too little.' Oddly, as against the view put to me by H. H. Joachim, it was the colleges in Oxford and Cambridge and the universities and their staffs elsewhere that really saw us through financially, as well as finding places for our refugees. It was from the colleges that in our most successful appeal, that of March 1939, we drew most of our larger gifts. Our strength lay in being a university outgrowth.

In a number of university towns—Birmingham, Durham, Leeds, Manchester, Glasgow, Aberdeen, and others—academic assistance committees were established to rouse local interest, get local money, and support our cause.

The Academic Assistance Council of May 1933 sprang from Hitler's attack on free learning in Germany. But the attack was not confined to Germany. The first Annual Report of the Council, published on May 1st, 1934, told of applications received from Russian, Austrian, Armenian, and Italian university teachers who found themselves unable to continue their work in their own countries. My personal files record in the next year, 1935, a Polish professor of law and economics and a Portuguese professor of biology, both turned out on political grounds. The second of these produced the comment from Walter Adams to me that in Portugal 'the wording of the Government decree of May 15th places the Universities at the mercy of the Government. As far as I know, public attention has not been called to this in Britain.' Our Third Report, covering the years 1935 to 1937, added Spain and Portugal formally to the countries presenting problems of displacement of teachers.

But it was not till the Fourth Report, published in November 1938, that dealing with academic refugees from countries other than Germany began to appear as a regular part of our activity. The year of that Report saw the annexation of Austria by Hitler in March, the spread of racial doctrines to Italy in the summer, and the partition of Czechoslovakia in October. Consideration of displacement from other countries than Germany is left, therefore, for my second chapter, covering the troubled years of peace after A.A.C. had become S.P.S.L.

The purpose of the A.A.C., as set out in its foundation document, was to help university teachers and investigators. This limitation of scope to university personnel was applied strictly in practice. We would have nothing to do with teachers in schools or other institutions not of university rank. We would not help members of the learned professions, such as law, medicine, architecture, music, or public administration, even of the most distinguished kind. My personal files are full of desperately hard cases of such men and women, recommended to me often by university teachers in the same subjects; in the next chapter I give a few examples of this, from the time just before World War II. I could do nothing but pass such cases on to someone else, or occasionally make a personal appeal to an influential friend. I could not and did not quarrel with the policy of practically all my colleagues on the A.A.C. It was a policy which at an early date, in March 1934, we had agreed with the Professional Committee of the Jewish organization for refugee

assistance. We were to limit our activity to helping refugees who desired and were fitted for an academic career. They were to limit themselves to persons fitted to pursue a professional career or studies of a peculiarly Jewish interest (such as Hebrew, Rabbinics, Jewish Philosophy, or Jewish History).

But, looking over my files today, I cannot help wishing that somehow we had established a more effective co-operation with a body that would look specially after the learned professions and was strong enough to do so effectively. In his first Report on Progress, dated August 1933, Walter Adams put the case of the professionals as one of the two major problems of policy before us:

There is no active agency for the professionals, comparable in efficiency or authority with the Academic Assistance Council. The professionals if charitably assisted in England will later pursue profitable careers (i.e. in medicine, music, law) in direct competition with English professionals. The absence of a concerted policy for assistance to professionals, and this economic difference in result . . . may cause public hostility to all immigration of German refugees (occasioned by an unwise assistance to professionals), and this hostility would seriously injure the work of the Academic Assistance Council. There is danger, however, in any loss by the Academic Assistance Council of its specialised academic basis, which ensures confidence in the University world; any co-operation with the committees for professionals should, therefore, not weaken the separate identity of the Academic Assistance Council.

The trouble, as Walter Adams noted, was not simply in the relative weakness of such bodies as the Refugee Professionals Committee, in comparison with ourselves. The trouble was that such bodies were faced with more professional jealousy than we were, and H.M. Government supported this jealousy; in May 1936, for instance, the Home Office announced that no refugee doctor or dentist would be allowed to set up in practice in Britain even if he were admitted by the Medical General Council.

By contrast, the general atmosphere in which the A.A.C. lived was one of acceptance of us, as maintainers of a great British tradition of helping refugees. Once, indeed, when the Royal Society arranged a party for academic refugees at Burlington House, some British Fascists threatened to break the party up, but this was dealt with easily. The Secretary of the Royal Society of that time, Griffith Davies, had in his day been a champion forward at Rugby football.

He organized a group of others like himself to deal with the enemy, and the enemy faded away. They thought discretion to be the better part of Fascism.

On another occasion, announcement of our desire to establish research fellowships of up to £450 a year for a few of our most distinguished refugees caused perturbation to a friend in one of the British universities who had been active in our work; his young British teachers did not get anything like that and would feel aggrieved. But the grievance was explained away and we went on with our £450 a year for refugees of world reputation.

Our universities, though they had to consider their British staff, in principle and in practice looked on freedom of learning as the most important thing in the world. They went to every length possible to help victims of attack on such freedom anywhere.

This attitude cannot be illustrated better than by the Huxley Memorial Lecture delivered by A. V. Hill in Birmingham on November 16th, 1933. Extracts from this lecture are printed as the next section of this chapter, under the heading of Learning and War.

Description of individual cases of refugees coming before us has been reserved in the main for later chapters. A few cases from early days are worth giving here to illustrate the variety of tasks that fell upon us from the very beginning, and fell particularly on the Professor of Chemistry who was our effective Honorary Secretary, though occasionally on me as well.

At the very first meeting of the Executive Committee, on June 14, 1933, we had before us the problem of the famous Warburg Library at Hamburg, in danger because of its largely Jewish staff. We commissioned Professors Charles Singer, C. S. Gibson, and W. G. Constable (of the Courtauld Institute of Art) to prepare a statement for our next meeting. They did so, in the form of a memorandum by Professor Constable; on June 22 we placed an interim grant at his disposal for rescue of the Warburg Institute and in nine months it was safely established here. I am glad today, from the mouth of one of its chiefs, now happily settled near Oxford, to throw light on this proceeding. As soon as the Hitler attack began, he urged on his German masters immediate flight from Hamburg, and was told not to worry; Hitler could not really mean what some thought and the danger would pass. But he insisted on worrying, made contact with the A.A.C., and met there a chemist who was

ready to be interested in art and, to his astonishment, although a professor, acted immediately.¹

A year later, in June 1934, the same chemist found himself writing to the Salmon and Trout Association at Fishmongers Hall asking for a grant in aid of Professor Tchernavin, a zoologist from Russia, so that he might study salmon on behalf of the Zoology Department of the British Museum. We were not, I think, successful in getting support for Tchernavin, either from the Salmon and Trout Association or later from the Fishmongers Company when we appealed to them directly. But we had enough money ourselves to keep him going and we found his fellow zoologists, whether in London or Edinburgh, only too ready to get his help. He settled down in Britain, declining all chances elsewhere, including the U.S.A. He came to us as early evidence that though the A.A.C. had been occasioned by Hitler's action, free learning needed defence against other tyrants also.

Tchernavin was a victim of the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917. Here is his account of himself as he gave it to us years later, when we were seeking naturalization for him.

Languages: Russian, English, French, German.

Military Service: 1914-15, wounded, invalided out of army, and resumed zoological work.

Other experience: 1917 and after, research interrupted by the Revolution. Some of the work was partly published and some not published at all.

1920-22. Difficulties increased by lack of equipment, warm clothing, food and by epidemics. Whole villages of fishermen died out almost completely in the region of investigation.

1924. Investigations of Caspian Sea—publication not permitted.

1925-30. Work constantly interrupted by the intrusion of different communist organizations and of political police (O.G.P.U.).

In 1928 I succeeded in getting permission to resign the management of the Department of Exploitation and to concentrate on research work. That saved my life in 1930 when all the leading specialists in Fisheries in U.S.S.R. were shot by the Bolsheviks (I got only 5 years hard labour in Prison Camp).

1930-32. Prisoner of the O.G.P.U. in the White Sea Solovetsky concentration camp, worked as fisherman and later as instructor.

¹ The saving of the Warburg Library and its later history are described at some length by Norman Bentwich on pp. 42-47 of his book, already quoted, on the *Rescue and Achievement of Refugee Scholars*.

1932. Escape to Finland.

1934. Came to England on invitation of the Academic Assistance Council.

His letters to us, letters of others about him, and his end in 1947 all show him as a gentle-hearted creature and student deserving a gentler world than fate allowed to him.

In the same month of June 1934, I found myself being urged by Professor Filon, my old friend on the London University Senate, to intervene on behalf of a distinguished German historian in a peculiarly ticklish matter. The historian was Professor Veit Valentin, driven out from the Berlin School of Economics and holding a temporary appointment in University College, London. He was a purely political refugee, without Jewish blood. The German authorities were now attempting to demand from this poor man's wife (whom he had not seen for a year) one-quarter of what they assessed to be his capital, on the plea of some new law whereby they confiscated 25 per cent. of the property of those Germans who have left Germany for good. Would I try, Filon asked me, through Sir John Simon, whom I knew well, to enlist the tactful intercession of the British Ambassador in Berlin on Valentin's behalf?¹

3. Learning and War

The invitation to A. V. Hill that he should give the Huxley Memorial Lecture came to him in January 1933, before Hitler's attack on freedom of learning had begun. When he came to give this lecture, in Birmingham on November 16th, 1933, he chose as his subject 'The International Status and Obligations of Science'—a subject that Hitler's attack had made of vital current importance.

The lecture began with two striking illustrations of how science and scientific men had been treated in wars of the past, one from the eighteenth century, and one from the nineteenth.

In 1796, Britain being then at war with France, a French scientific sailor, Chevalier de Rossel, a prisoner of war in England evidently on parole, dined with the Royal Society Club in London on the invitation of Alexander Dalrymple, the hydrographer to the Admiralty. The Navy, as

¹ I have not been able to discover any result of this application. Fortunately, early in 1936 we found ourselves able to award to Valentin a fellowship of £450 a year for three years. He ended his days in 1947 as a distinguished Adviser in the Library of Congress.

well as the Royal Society, clearly regarded scientific standing as entitling its holder to civilized and friendly treatment, regardless of the misfortune of a state of war between the two countries.

Among the instructions issued by the Admiralty to the Captain of H.M.S. *Rattlesnake*, in which Huxley sailed in 1846 as 'a surgeon who knew something about science', was the following: 'You are to refrain from any act of aggression towards a vessel or settlement of any nation with which we may be at war, as expeditions employed on behalf of discovery and science have always been considered by all civilized communities as acting under a general safeguard.'

'Science', the lecturer proceeded, 'is a common interest of mankind; whatever the barriers or the difficulties of the struggles between them, civilized societies have accorded a certain immunity and tolerance to people concerned with scientific discovery and learning.' 'Why should science be singled out in this way', he asks, and how should scientists act in order to preserve as completely as possible their special position? His answer is based on famous words describing the business of the Royal Society nearly 300 years ago: Its business is to improve the knowledge of natural things, 'not meddling with Divinity, Metaphysics, Moralls, Politicks, Grammar, Rhetorick or Logick'.

'Not meddling with morals or politics: such, I would urge, is the normal condition of tolerance and immunity for scientific pursuits in a civilized state.' In saying this, A. V. Hill had natural science in mind. But his thesis applies to everything that calls itself science. A few years later I applied it to my own field of studies, economics and politics.¹ I made myself unpopular with some of my colleagues, but every year I become more certain that I was right. The Huxley Memorial Lecture of 1933 is full of things worth saying.

When A. V. Hill's lecture was given, in November 1933, immunity for science and learning had just been swept away in Germany, a country unexcelled, as the lecturer had said, in its contribution to science in the past hundred years. Today freedom of learning of all kinds is imperilled over large areas of the world.

Today, as we all know, natural science presents us with a new problem. It has brought mankind to a simple choice, between, on the one hand, material prosperity and ease of life beyond its wildest dreams, and, on the other hand, mass destruction without parallel,

¹ Oration Address at London School of Economics and Political Science in July 1937. See *Power and Influence*, pp. 252-4.

of men and all that men have made. The fact that we must face this choice is no fault of the scientists and they cannot make the choice for us. One wishes only that the author of the Huxley Memorial Lecture of 1933 or another like him could give us a new lecture on science as it looks today and how it can be made again the international servant of man, instead of his means of self-destruction.

But this is a problem beyond the scope of this book. I return to the story of the Academic Assistance Council and how it changed its name without changing its purpose or its work.

4. A.A.C. becomes Society for the Protection of Science and Learning (S.P.S.L.)

The Academic Assistance Council was nearly always in financial difficulties. In its third year there came a moment when it seemed possible that the Council might cease to exist, at least as an agency for providing incomes. Its Second Report, dated July 20, 1935, pointed out that there had been no substantial increase in the number of displaced German scholars. The Report, looking forward to the future, declared as the policy of the Council the ending of its emergency grants by 31st July 1936.

The Council recognizes that some of the scholars will not even then be re-established, but feels that it would be unjustifiable to continue emergency help for more than three years. If necessary, responsibility for these persons will have to be transferred to charitable relief agencies.

The Council proposes to continue its information centre and place-finding organization as long as possible, for it feels that there will be a continuing need for these services.

The past year, on account of the number of public appeals which have been made for the King's Jubilee Trust and other purposes, has not been a favourable one for raising funds to place the work of academic assistance on a more permanent basis.

These passages suggest that in July 1935 the members of the A.A.C. were much in the dumps, fearing that they might be compelled by lack of money to draw in their horns, hoping that conditions in Germany would not get much worse. But Mr. Kittredge of the Rockefeller Foundation had told them a month before that things in Germany would get worse. And they did get worse, through the new Nuremberg law and in other ways.

Today I find it hard to believe that the members of the A.A.C.

seriously contemplated drawing in their horns, or that the pessimism of the July 1935 Report was more than a device for collecting financial support.

Long before July 1935 I had begun to make plans for a Trust for the Preservation of Science and Learning. In September 1935, in consultation with Sir Robert Waley Cohen, I took these plans further—suggesting that the A.A.C. should establish as its successor a Society for the Preservation of Science and Learning, with an Academic Assistance Trust of the highest distinction to hold funds for the Society, and that all members of the A.A.C. should automatically become members of the Society's Council. 'There is clear need for a permanent organization for the defence of science and learning against attacks such as those from which they are suffering in Germany and elsewhere.'

The Council members happily accepted this argument and drew courage from their difficulties. Instead of winding themselves up as much as possible, they decided to change themselves into a permanent organization. In December 1935 my memorandum¹ for this purpose was approved formally by the Executive Committee of the A.A.C., with one significant change of title. The A.A.C. was to become a Society for the *Protection* of Science and Learning rather than for their preservation. In March 1936 the Society was announced formally in a document signed by Lord Rutherford as President of the Council.

The Academic Assistance Council was formed in May, 1933, to assist scholars and scientists who, on grounds of religion, race or opinion, were unable to continue their work in their own country. Its services have been needed chiefly to help the 1,300 University teachers displaced in Germany, but it has also assisted refugee scholars from Russia, Portugal and other countries.

In co-operation with other organisations, the Council has assisted in permanently re-establishing 363 of the 700 displaced scholars who left Germany. A further 324 are still being temporarily maintained in Universities and learned institutions while seeking more permanent positions. The Council has directly received over £46,000 in donations which, with the exception of the small amount used for paying fares of displaced scholars to positions overseas, administrative expenses and other incidental purposes, have been employed in subsidising research by our refugee guests. The Council, as the international centre for this work, has

¹ Memorandum of December 11th, 1935. Printed below in Appendix 3.

built up a place-finding organisation and information service which are proving of increasing usefulness.

The Council hoped that its work might be required for only a temporary period, but is now convinced that there is need for a permanent body to assist scholars who are victims of political and religious persecutions. The devastation of the German Universities still continues; not only University teachers of Jewish descent, but many others who are regarded as 'politically unreliable' are being prevented from making their contribution to the common cause of scholarship.

The Council has decided to establish as its permanent successor a Society for the Protection of Science and Learning, which will continue the Council's various forms of assistance to scholars of any country who, on grounds of religion, race or opinion, are unable to carry on the scientific work for which they are qualified. One function of the Society will be to build up an Academic Assistance Fund to award research fellowships, tenable in the Universities of Great Britain and other countries by the most distinguished of the refugee scholars.

This Fund will be administered under the auspices of His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, the President of the Royal Society, the President of the British Academy, Lord Horder, the Hon. R. H. Brand and myself.

On this announcement of the Society and Fund followed an appeal 'to all those who wish to assist in the defence of free learning and science' to join the Society by paying a minimum annual subscription of a guinea, with more if possible.

This appeal is made with the full co-operation of the organisers of the National Christian Appeal which is about to be made for the destitute non-Jewish refugees from Germany, since the Society will be giving assistance to only one section, namely the scholars, among the German refugees, irrespective of the religious affiliations. It is therefore with confidence that I ask support from both the Christian and the Jewish world, and in particular from the University world, to place this most important part of the refugee work on a firm financial basis.

Lord Rutherford, in this historic document of March 1936, invented the title which more than twenty years after has been given to my record of his work: 'A Defence of Free Learning.'

2. The Society at Work in Troubled Peace. 1936-9

1. Spreading of Persecution

IN THEIR FOUNDATION MEMORANDUM of May 1933 the Academic Assistance Council said that though the issue causing their birth had been raised acutely at that moment in Germany, the issue was not confined to that country. 'The aims of the Council are the strengthening of constructive and positive toleration, and the preservation of learning, irrespective of nationality, race, creed, or political opinion.'

But though cases of scholars in danger, in countries other than Germany, had been noticed by the A.A.C. from its beginning,¹ Germany presented, for some years, the only substantial problem in this field. And, even in Germany, the problem at first appeared limited. Till the middle of 1935 there was no rapid increase in the number of displaced scholars.

In the second half of 1935 the picture changed completely. The Nuremberg legislation of the autumn of that year, defining in detail those excluded as 'Jews' and removing some of the exceptions made even for Jews in 1933, as for war service by oneself or one's father in 1914-18, led to dismissal of many more university teachers. And Hitler's evil example went on spreading to other countries. So far from becoming a mere labour exchange in 1936, the Academic Assistance Council, as has been told already, decided in that year to change its name to Society for the Protection of Science and Learning, as a permanent organization for dealing with what seemed to be a permanent and growing evil.

The Third Report, published in July 1937 under the name of the new Society, identified in future as S.P.S.L., having noted continuance of appeals for help from Austria, Russia, and Italy, as stated in the last chapter, brought in for the first time two other countries—Portugal and Spain.

In Portugal a decree of May 1935 required pensioning or dis-

¹ See p. 18 above.

missal of officials 'who show a spirit of opposition to the fundamental principles of the Constitution' or 'withhold guarantee of co-operation in the realization of the higher aims of the State'. 'Officials' included in Portugal university teachers. The Society was called on to help six university teachers from Portugal, as well as two Portuguese scholars who were refugees from an earlier period.

In Spain, the Civil War raging from 1936 to 1939 led not only to closing of universities and cessation of scientific work there, but also to flight abroad of many university teachers, researchers, and students, who were in danger from one or other of the main parties in the war. Sixty Spanish scholars known to the Society were outside Spain in 1937. The Society did all it could to make contact with these refugees, and did something at least to help them.

In Russia, where a number of distinguished men had taken early refuge from Hitler, the uncertainties of a scholar's life under Soviet rule were illustrated repeatedly in the years of troubled peace.

The assassination of Kirov, for instance, in 1934 led to a series of purges of foreigners. Quite a number of scientists found themselves forced to leave hurriedly in June 1935, one in particular, a physicist known to me, in spite of strong efforts of his Leningrad colleagues to retain him. After a few months he received some sort of invitation to return, but he preferred to stay in Britain, where he has now been established and naturalized as a Professor of Theoretical Physics and a Fellow of the Royal Society. He told me that the purge at his Leningrad institute had not been directed against foreigners only; shortly before he left, a number of his scientific Russian colleagues had been arrested and sent to concentration camps and one at least had been killed.

A new and more vigorous purge followed in 1937, when most foreign scientists in Russia were either expelled or imprisoned—some of them till they died.

One of the most fortunate of those who took refuge from Hitler with the Soviet was F. G. Houtermans, an assistant professor at the Technical High School of Berlin-Charlottenburg when Hitler's racial law drove him out. Having obtained, on recommendation by Lord Rutherford, a position in an industrial laboratory in Russia, he went on to pure research on neutrons for three years till near the end of 1937 when the new persecution of foreigners set in. Receiving offers of help from leading scientists of many countries, he tried to escape but was caught and imprisoned for another three

or four years, including isolation in a cell of the Ljubianka prison. Representations on his behalf from western countries continued, and the Soviet agreed at last to let him out of Russia. But their way of doing this—World War II had begun—was to push him into German-occupied Poland and the hands of the Gestapo. Once again the highest scientific authorities appealed for him, and this time he received real release. He became in due course and is now Professor Houtermans, head of the Physics Institute of the University of Berne.

Professor Houtermans was more fortunate than others who tried the Russian escape from Hitler. A very distinguished mathematician from Breslau, after a few years as professor at Tomsk, was sent to a Soviet prison and stayed there under a twenty-five-year sentence for espionage until he died. Yet another physicist from Hanover actually produced in Russia and published in 1937 an *Introduction to Quantum Chemistry*. But he was arrested in the same year and was never heard of again.

The Fourth Report of S.P.S.L., in recording the 1937 purge, attributes it to xenophobia. Today I cannot help suspecting that it represented a step in the coming together of Soviet and Hitler for joint action in 1939.

Before the end of 1937 it had become clear to S.P.S.L. and to similar agencies in other European countries that defence of free learning was a growing need and that defence would be more effective if our agencies worked in co-operation. A French committee reorganized under driving-power of Louis Rapkine took the lead in urging such co-operation, and I celebrated my return to Oxford as Master of University College by acting there as host to an informal International Meeting held on November 14 and 15 to consider how such co-operation could be brought about. We had representatives from France, Belgium, Denmark, Sweden, and the German *Notgemeinschaft*, as well as from the Council for German Jewry, the Royal Society, and the National Academy of Sciences of the U.S.A. The main conclusion of the representatives was to favour the setting up of an international body, with Niels Bohr of Denmark as Chairman, to secure closer co-operation between agencies formed to help displaced teachers; they suggested, as a first step to creation of this body, that S.P.S.L. should add two representatives each of eleven other countries to its Council. When the report of this Oxford Meeting came before the Executive of S.P.S.L. in December, they

welcomed it with open arms, put all arrangements in hand for giving constitutional effect to it, and were ready to bear the expenses involved.

International machinery on the lines proposed at Oxford was set up in due course. But the enemy moved too fast for us, with persecution spreading through 1938 to the war of 1939. The international committee ended in effect with the collapse of France in 1940.

But, for me at least, the Oxford meeting of November 1937 was not wasted. It brought home to me more clearly than anything else the exceptionally favourable conditions in which S.P.S.L. could do its work, through the solid support of our universities.

Our most important counterpart, the American Emergency Committee for Displaced Scholars, was not represented at the conference, but Dr. Simon Flexner, representing the National Academy of Sciences in Washington, with all his sympathy for us, gave a damping account of prospects in the United States. There was opposition from the younger men in the American universities to the introduction of more Germans, and this opposition would continue even if ample funds were available; in certain fields of science saturation-point had already been reached. Dr. Flexner said that there might be a field of absorption for refugee scientists in industry, but our German delegate Dr. Demuth, who had visited America earlier in 1937 to examine possibilities of setting up an organization for industrial placing, had been advised everywhere not to attempt this. It would create enemies in the industrial field, just as they had been created in the academic field; individuals must be left to their own efforts.

After hearing all this, I understood much better than before why the American Emergency Committee had not undertaken our main function of acting as a labour exchange to find academic places for refugee scholars, but left the universities to pick out men for themselves; had confined their activities to men of established reputation; and in 1935 had urged us to send no more refugee scholars to the United States, for they were full already. We had not consented to leave the States out of our picture, but had adopted the practical device of paying fares outright or as loans to scholars who had offers there, or paying return fares for scholars who seemed to have a chance of finding places, either in universities or in industry, if they went in person. As is shown in another chapter, half the scholars

known to us to be in the United States when World War II ended, had got there through our help or by themselves.¹ Having regard to the difficulties, the achievement of the American Emergency Committee in rescuing the other half is all the more notable.

In saying farewell as host to the delegates, I expressed the hope that the contrast between the beauty of Oxford and the ugliness of the fate of displaced scholars would inspire all to continued efforts on behalf of their unfortunate colleagues. Oxford today is less lovely than she was in November 1937; she has suffered twenty-one years of planless growth. Europe in November 1937 was on the brink of plunging into ugliness undreamed of before, through sharpening and spreading of persecution.

The annexation of Austria in March 1938, with ruthless application of Nazi doctrines, confronted the Society with unprecedented problems; we had to record at least 418 academic workers as displaced from Austrian universities and institutions, and to give such help as we could. We added in our Report that the figure of 418 displaced 'does not include those who have died or committed suicide'. These 418 had to be added to the 1,400 displaced by 1938 in Germany alone, as Hitler's direct responsibility.

The spread of racial doctrines to Italy followed in the summer of 1938. It led to dismissal from Italian universities of at least 140 full-time professors and many junior teachers. It compelled those Jewish and liberal scholars who since 1933 had found refuge in Italy to look for refuge elsewhere.

The partition of Czechoslovakia in October 1938 raised the same two problems as those noted for Italy. A number of Jewish and politically non-conformist Czechoslovak citizens who had been teaching in institutions of higher learning, including the German university at Prague, found themselves under anti-semitic or totalitarian bans. A number of professors from Russia who had long been established in Czechoslovakia had to move once more, if they wanted freedom for their work.

Nineteen thirty-eight, with the spread and imitation of Hitler over most of western Europe, was the first year in which the refugee problem, which we had known in our special field since 1933, became a matter of national and world concern. In Britain a Lord Mayor's Fund for Czechoslovakia was opened in October and a Stanley Baldwin Fund for refugees generally was launched by a broadcast

¹ Chapter 5, p. 92.

on December 8. President Roosevelt, on the initiative of Cordell Hull, called a conference of many Powers on the refugee problem generally, to be held at Evian on the Lake of Geneva in July. Representatives of thirty nations duly came there and conferred from July 6 to 19. Italy and Switzerland alone refused their invitations. Germany was not invited.

Appeals like those of the Lord Mayor and Stanley Baldwin brought in money for refugees on a scale undreamt of hitherto. We had to make sure, if we could, that our scholars were not forgotten in the rush. For they too would be rising in numbers. We planned a special appeal in prospect for early 1939. We had to save that from being swamped by all the other appeals. We had to get our share out of them.

By 1938 it was becoming doubtful whether voluntary action could raise enough money to deal with the coming storm. On April 8th I wrote a letter to *The Times*, urging the Government to make refugees their concern. In May I saw Robert Vansittart at the Foreign Office, to persuade him if I could that the Government should put us financially in a position to do something at once for Austrian academic refugees—something that they could announce at the Evian conference. I followed this with a letter expressing the hope that the British representative at this conference would be in a position to urge an active policy in respect of scholars and scientists at least and to promise practical financial support.

By May 1939 the categories of refugees needing the protection of their High Commissioner were listed by the League of Nations as follows, with two important explanations at the end:

(a) Russian, Armenian, and assimilated refugees, as defined by the League Arrangements of May 12th, 1926, and June 30th, 1928 (Documents R./I.G.C.T. 1926, and L.S.C./11-1928 (1), covered by the Convention of October 28th, 1933 (Documents C. 650. M. 311. 1933, and C. 650 (a) M. 311 (a) 1933).

(b) Refugees from the Saar as defined in the Arrangement of May 24th, 1935 (Document CL. 120. 1935. XII).

(c) German refugees as defined in the Provisional Arrangement of July 4th, 1936 (Document C. 362. M. 237. 1936. XII) and the Convention of February 10th, 1938 (Document C. 75. M. 30. 1938. XII).

(d) Refugees from the territory which formerly constituted Austria by a decision of the Council on May 14th, 1938 (Document C. 188. 1938. XII).

(e) Refugees from the areas ceded by Czechoslovakia to Germany as

defined in the resolution of the Council of January 17th, 1939 (Document C. 50. 1939. XII).

So far as the refugees formerly under the Nansen International Office are concerned (categories (a) and (b)), the High Commissioner has certain funds at his disposal which are distributed for the purpose of relief through private organizations. He has practically no funds for the relief of other refugees.

Apart from the legal protection of refugees, or unless a question of principle is involved, the High Commissioner does not ordinarily take up individual cases, which are referred to the appropriate organization. It is his endeavour to keep in touch with the latter and to assist them in all matters coming within his authority.

The sting of this list lies in its accuracy of wording combined with its absence of practical relief for any except the two categories (a) and (b) taken over from the Nansen International Office. The world was becoming less rather than more humane.

In 1939 decision for government action and government money came with the setting up of a Central Committee for Refugees under a distinguished former Indian Civil Servant, Sir Herbert Emerson, as chairman. But this is part of the war story rather than the pre-war story and is left for Chapter 3.

2. The Cases we Helped

The spreading of persecution on racial or political grounds emphasized the special nature of the task on which the A.A.C. and its successor S.P.S.L. were engaged, as described already in my Preface.¹ We had to keep body and spirit and learning alive in a particular kind of human being. We could not do this by ourselves but only by the free co-operation of universities and other independent institutions.

The practical difference between helping academic refugees and helping refugees generally came out clearly on the outbreak of World War II, in the dealings between S.P.S.L. and the Central Refugees Committee established by H.M. Government for helping refugees out of money raised by taxation.²

A more important difference lay in the method of work forced on A.A.C.-S.P.S.L. Every case that came before them had to be examined individually and had to receive the exact treatment that it needed.

¹ pp. v-vi.

² See Chapter 3, pp. 53-54.

To ensure personal examination of each case the A.A.C. set up an Allocation Committee which met for the first time on July 13th, 1933. I found myself chosen Chairman, and presided over most of the meetings till the outbreak of World War II, leading to removal of our office to Cambridge, made this activity impossible for me. I had moved in 1937 from London to Oxford to become Master of University College. In place of the Allocation Committee under my chairmanship, a Cambridge Allocation Committee, presided over by Sir John Clapham, was established.

The first meeting of the original Allocation Committee in July 1933 had important general business, including receipt of replies from vice-chancellors of British universities to a circular letter which we had sent to them in June, and the sending of a further letter to them about the Rockefeller Foundation's activity, which had been agreed by me with the head of the Foundation, Max Mason. But this first meeting had only twelve individual cases and lasted only $1\frac{1}{2}$ hours. It was the shortest Allocation Committee recorded in my chairmanship.

The later meetings ranged from $1\frac{1}{4}$ through 2, $2\frac{1}{4}$, $2\frac{1}{2}$, 3 hours, up to 5 hours on July 3rd, 1934. On that heroic occasion we made 31 new grants to individual refugee applicants, renewed 41 grants already in force, approved 7 grants made on our behalf by officers of the Council, and decided not to renew 10 existing grants. After this we felt justified in not meeting again till October 19th, when in $2\frac{1}{2}$ hours we approved 8 grants made in the vacation by our officers, made 18 new grants including one for giving a lecture, and refused 9 grants.

The Allocation Committee did not spare itself. But it did not have the final word. That lay with the Executive Committee; indeed at times the Executive Committee took on the work of making or ending or varying grants to scholars directly. The minutes of the Executive Committee from May 1935 onwards contain several pages of decisions on individual cases, sometimes more pages of decisions than go to all the rest of the business.

The varied human problems involved in defence of free learning against persecution cannot be illustrated better than by extracts from these minutes; they deserve more than a hasty glance. To show their character to readers of this book, I have made a selection from the records of two meetings, that of September 30, 1938, and that of May 25, 1939, both near the end of troubled peace. In each case, in

accord with the general policy stated in my Preface, I have left out names, giving only the subjects of those who came before us for grants and the places from which they came. But I have added in parentheses the present position of our grantees, so far as we know it.

In the Executive Committee minutes of September 30, 1938, there came first the cancellations of grants already approved; one for the sad reason that the grantee, a physiologist from Hamburg, had found it impossible to leave Germany for his proposed research on Delicate Children;¹ three for the cheering reason that the grantees had found definite appointments. One of the three, a medievalist from Vienna, no longer needed the £60 allotted to him for a visit to the U.S.A., because he had been given a lectureship at the Institute of Medieval Studies in Toronto; he was allowed instead £3. 10s. to maintain him for four weeks before he could set sail. (He is now a Professor of History in the United States.) The second of the three, a classical philologist from Munich (now a Professor of Latin in London), did not need after August 31st a twelve months' grant of £50 given to him in the previous November, as he had been made a Senior Assistant at Belfast University; he was allowed instead the usual grant for September as a loan. The third scholar, a geologist from Freiburg, did not need after July 31st, 1938, the grant of £50 a year made to him for two years; he had been appointed to a two-year studentship of £300 a year at the London Museum. (He is now a Professor of Environmental Archaeology in London.)

After these cancellations came approval of payments made by officers on special grounds during the vacation just ended. A physicist from Vienna needed and received in August £2 as application fee for a vacancy in Ireland (he was a monitor for the B.B.C. during the war, and we lost touch with him; but we believe he emigrated). A mathematician from Berlin need £30 for a fare to the U.S.A. and received it, half from the general funds of our Society and half from the *Notgemeinschaft*.² (At the time of his death in 1952 he was a physicist in the U.S. Navy Department and part-time lecturer in the University of Maryland.) A romance philologist from Madrid (now Professor of Modern Languages at the University College of

¹ Happily he made his way out of Germany later; the 1942 Report of the Allocation Committee at Cambridge recorded payment of an earmarked grant to him in the year before. After the war ended he went back to Germany where he died.

² The full title was *Notgemeinschaft Deutscher Wissenschaftler im Ausland*.

the West Indies), who had been granted £182 a year up to August 14th, 1938, needed to have it continued to September 30th when he was starting on a new appointment in Glasgow; it was continued, of course.¹ An historian of unstated origin received £5 'to meet a special emergency'. An historian from Berlin received in August and September £44 as loan for living expenses before leaving for the U.S.A. and a payment on September 5th of £5 for final expenses of departure. (He is now Professor in the Department of Political Science in Chicago.)

Next came extension of grants already made. To a philologist from Madrid (now Professor of Latin at the University of Tucuman in the Argentine) a contribution up to £150 including payment of fare for husband, wife, and children to Buenos Aires; the wife had been an organ scholar at Girton. To an art historian from Hamburg (now Professor of Art History at Dumbarton Oaks, Georgetown, Washington, D.C.) continuance of his grant of £150 a year, with return fare to the United States. To a philosopher from Heidelberg (now Professor of Philosophy at McGill University, Montreal) £75 for a year from October 1st, 1938. To a chemist from Göttingen (now Professor in the Department of Botany in the University of Illinois) extension of his grant of £250 a year for two months from October 1st, the money to come from the I.C.I. fund.

Finally came new applications, some granted, usually on conditions, some refused. To a law teacher from Vienna, described as a supplementary case, a grant up to £50 was allowed for living expenses in America should he secure a visa to go there. (He is now Professor of Jurisprudence at the University of California.) To a neurologist from Breslau, a grant at £250 a year for six months was allowed 'on condition that Professor Cairns will take full responsibility for subsequent re-establishment or support'.² To an experimental pathologist, a similar condition was applied; she had been doing research in Copenhagen when she became a refugee unable to return to Germany, and the Society had no record of where she

¹ He came originally from Danzig, but had taken a post as romance philologist, not a refugee, at Madrid. The Spanish Revolution, not Hitler, unseated him.

² A later report from the Allocation Committee at Cambridge records a grant to this neurologist of £100 a year for nine months from April 1st, 1940, to supplement a similar grant from the Nuffield Fund, for research at the Radcliffe Infirmary, Oxford. He is now Director of the Spinal Injuries Centre at the Ministry of Pensions Hospital, Stoke Mandeville. He received the first Rehabilitation Prize of the World Veterans Federation.

had worked in Germany. She was allowed a grant at £120 a year for three months in the first instance 'if Dr. Honor B. Fell will assume responsibility for subsequent re-establishment or support'; Dr. Fell was Director of the Strangeways Research Laboratory at Cambridge and no doubt able to take this responsibility. (This pathologist is now Sir Hailey Stewart Fellow at the Strangeways Laboratory.) To a pharmacologist from Graz, a grant of £50-£100 for three years was allowed 'to supplement money raised in Holland; total not to exceed £450 a year'. (He shared the Nobel Prize in 1936 with Sir Henry Dale, is now a Foreign Member of the Royal Society, was awarded the Cameron Prize in Edinburgh, and elected F.R.S.E. in 1944.) To a law teacher from Freiburg came a grant of £50 a year to supplement a grant from Merton College. (Now beyond retiring age, he continues as a part-time professor at Freiburg-im-Breisgau and still does some tutorial work at Oxford.) To a musicologist from Austria, a grant of not more than £100 a year for one year was given, to make up his total income to £450 a year; this was still continuing in 1941-2 from earmarked funds.¹

The refusals outright were rare. More typical was the treatment of an art historian from Heidelberg and a biologist from Austria. While the Society felt unable to make a grant to this particular art historian, 'the Chairman undertook to make inquiries regarding this type of work at the British Museum, to be financed from an outside source'. To the biologist a grant was refused only 'pending further information regarding the possibility of securing finances for him from private sources'. He was in fact the son of an old and valued colleague of mine in another field and my private files are full of him.

From the meeting of May 25, 1939, I give a few special cases only, to show the bewildering variety of action needed and taken to keep scholars at work. The A.A.C. had adopted as a guide to the scale of grants £182 a year for a man or woman alone and £250 a year for a man and wife. The actual grants were almost always different. They varied from sums added to money raised elsewhere in order to provide respectable incomes, to fares for travel to the U.S.A. and other countries, or living expenses in Britain, sometimes by way of loan, till the journey could begin. They included loans for the

¹ See report of Cambridge Allocation Committee in March 1942. This grantee became Reader in Music at Oxford and Fellow of Lincoln College. He is a C.B.E. and F.B.A.

cost of getting a Ph.D. degree (£30)¹ or buying books needed in taking up new appointments in Ecuador (two Spaniards at £15 each); they descended to £2 as application fee for a vacancy in Ireland. All countries were alike to our Society, from Argentina to which, as stated below, we helped a philologist to the tune of £150, to proceed with his wife and children, to Australia or Denmark to which we transferred a grant as soon as it seemed that Denmark was the place in which another Spaniard on our roll could work most happily.

The Executive meeting of May 25, 1939, the last meeting but one before troubled peace gave way to open war, illustrated the growing importance of countries other than Germany as a source of academic refugees. The next meeting, of June 29, 1939, made this unmistakable. By that time Germany's place as the main source of applicants to our Society had been taken by Austria—19—and Czechoslovakia—11—against 6 for Germany, 3 for Italy, and 2 for Spain. The German scholars who had succeeded in getting out of Germany were to a large extent already established in countries of refuge.

An outstanding feature of all these meetings is the amount of trouble taken in spending very little money. We had hardly any money in 1938, in face of the spreading attack that we had to answer. We had more money in May and June, 1939, as the result of a national appeal just made, but we could not know then that World War II would come so soon. We still felt bound to use our sixpences as sprats to catch herrings from other donors. We still had to think out just what help was needed to make a new life of usefulness possible to each individual refugee who came before us.

Unsparring gift of individual time and thought in defence of free learning was the cornerstone of our work. It will appear again in the chapter that follows, both in the regular work of allocations and in the special work of dealing with wholesale internment of our refugees by the British Government.

Another feature is the way in which our money help came no longer to be needed, as it achieved its purpose—of establishing a scholar or scientist in a permanent situation. Moreover, as proscription of free learning spread between 1933 and 1939 to new countries,

¹ As a matter of principle, S.P.S.L. did not encourage refugees already holding a doctorate to take a Ph.D. in Britain. Grants for such a purpose were exceptional.

there came one welcome easing of the task of our Society. Germany before Hitler had been a land distinguished for learning in many fields. Before World War II began, refugees from German universities had been established in most of the important countries of the world, and their co-operation in helping those not yet established was becoming decisive. 'A notable feature of the work for German scholars has been the predominant part played by the scholars themselves in assisting their colleagues.' So the Society summed up at the end of its section on Germany, in its Report of November 1938.

The same Report gave statistical tables covering all displaced scholars known to us, with their subjects and the countries in which they had been placed, by ourselves or by other agencies in the same field. The figures are summarized here:

PERMANENTLY PLACED

Five hundred and twenty-four had been placed in presumably permanent situations: 378 in academic institutions and 146 in industry or general research.

The 524 represented 20 different subjects ranging from 142 Medicine, 62 Chemistry, 52 Economics, 39 Physics, 37 Philology, 31 Biology, 26 Mathematics, 25 Law, down to 4 each Archaeology and Geology, 3 Theology, 2 Dentistry.

They had been placed in 36 different countries, ranging from 161 U.S.A., 128 Britain, 46 Palestine, 45 Turkey, 15 France, down to 1 each Albania, Iraq, New Zealand, Poland, Spain, Syria, and Yugoslavia.

TEMPORARILY PLACED

Three hundred and six had been placed temporarily. They represented 19 different subjects, from 74 Medicine, 30 Chemistry, 29 Physics, 25 Philology, 22 Economics, 20 Biology, down to 2 Theology, and 1 each Education, Geology, and Musicology.

These substantial figures of placings have to be compared with the much larger figures of displacement recorded in the same Report and set out earlier in this chapter—1,400 for Germany, 418 for Austria, 140 plus for Italy, 60 plus for Spain, and so on. Comparison led to a formal warning—that with growing calls for help and diminishing resources the Society's work had reached a crisis:

The ability of the Society to maintain its activity in the new conditions will depend largely on the response which is made in terms of moral and material support to the national appeal which it will issue in February next.¹

Successful overcoming of the crisis is recorded below.²

3. Some Cases we could not Help

To the Authorizations and Grants set out above, I add a few cases of intellectual men and women under persecution—for whom no help came. I begin with one, named already in my preface.

In 1938 my connection with the beginnings of labour exchanges and social insurance thirty years before brought before me a tragic story of a victim of Hitler whom the S.P.S.L. could not help, because the victim was not a university teacher.

As an official of the Board of Trade concerned with labour exchanges I went with other officials to Germany in 1909 to study their system. As a letter to my mother reported, we arrived from Düsseldorf at Berlin and were housed in the most luxurious rooms of the most expensive hotel, Conrad Uhl's Hotel Bristol, Unter den Linden; my Scottish caution led me to calculate at once that the cost to us would 'much exceed the 20/- or 30/- a day allowance which we get from a grateful country'. At the Berlin Labour Exchange, about the largest in Germany or the world, we met as its head a woman of 30 (exactly my age at that time), Dr. Speer-Klausner. Nearly thirty years after I received the following letter from Liverpool.

5 Ullet Road,

LIVERPOOL 8.

17th December 1938.

Dear Sir William Beveridge,

I write to solicit your interest and help on behalf of Dr. Speer-Klausner. This lady was head of the Central Labour Exchange Office at Berlin from 1909 to 1914 and from 1909 she was consulted by the British Government in connection with the establishment of Employment Exchanges in this country. She mentions you as one of those in touch with her at that time.

During the war years Dr. Speer-Klausner undertook industrial work, including the management of a factory, manufacturing war materials. Subsequently she became a Judge at the Law Court for Labour at

¹ Fourth Report, p. 11.

² pp. 47 and 48.

Berlin, and she remained at this post until the Decree of May 1936 compelled her to give up her career.

For the last two years she has worked as a cook and she begs us to try to obtain a similar post for her in this country. Unfortunately she is now 59 years of age, and we have not so far been successful in obtaining the promise of work for her here. Can you help us to help her in this matter? I need not tell you of the gratitude we should feel, if this is possible.

Unfortunately we have already committed ourselves to maintaining a friend at present in a concentration camp and are unable to offer more than a small contribution towards Dr. Speer-Klausner's settlement here.

Dr. Klausner's letter, in which she mentions her association with you, concludes: 'only necessity forces me to refer to services which, so many years ago, I was extremely glad to give.'

Yours faithfully,

(sgd.) R. HUWS JONES.

No doubt Huws Jones wrote at the same time to Dr. Speer,¹ naming me as a possible helper and took steps himself to find a home for her. For on January 1st, 1939, came a note from her to me: 'Home found with Mr. and Mrs. Hall, Alderside, Highfield Rd. in Blackpool—as household help' only to be followed at the end of January by a note from Berlin 'No permit yet'. I wrote at once to the Aliens Department of the Home Office urging immediate granting of a visa, as to a person of importance, integrity, and service to Britain. There followed weary months of administrative procedure and correspondence. I print one letter of April 2, 1939, to my private secretary of that time, to show Dr. Speer's resourcefulness and that of her friends. Nothing but circumlocution here was keeping her from safety and care in the United States.

Berlin W.62, Kleistrasse 13,
April 2nd, 1939.

I received your kind note of March 31st with very great pleasure, as I am waiting anxiously for news from your country.

No, till now, I did not get the visa. On the 12th of February—on the 6th of February Sir William Beveridge had written to the Home-Office on my behalf—I heard from Liverpool that, up to recently, the Home Office does no longer grant the Permit doing domestic help above the age of 45. Therefore Mr. and Mrs. Hall, Blackpool, Alderside, Highfield Road, filled up a hospitality form on my behalf and despatched it to London, Bloomsbury House. That took place at about the 20th of Feb-

¹ Born Klausner, she married Speer and I describe her by her married name here.

ruary. I sent, to the same address, the photocopy of my registration number for U.S.A. (56,485), and up to to-day, I did not hear anything from the part of Bloomsbury House.

I should be very grateful to Sir William Beveridge and to yourself, if you would trouble again yourself to take steps which you deem helpful, for the granting of my application.

The risk for the country is not so important as Mr. and Mrs. Hall are willing to take me into their house for the period I shall be obliged to stay in England until my turn for going to U.S.A. will have come.

In the U.S.A. my stepson is waiting for my husband and myself; he will be able to support us.

I think it is not want of modesty when I pretend that I am able to show my gratefulness to Sir William Beveridge on a sphere which, once, has been his favorite. And so it has been to me. I imagine, I have ideas of my own concerning this branch of social work.

I deeply felt the kindness underlying your note of yesterday.

Yours very truly

(sgd.) EDITH SPEER.

At last on June 2, 1939, Edith Speer received the visa—and could not use it. She had been ill and nursed by her sister and now her sister had died.

Five months I was waiting anxiously for the permit and the moment I received it I am not able to use it. My physician told me it will take at least three months till I shall recover from the shock I had.

As I arranged for my husband to live together with my sisters for the time of my stay in England, now I have to try to make other arrangements for him.

That, dated June 17, 1939, was the last letter I had from Edith Speer. Soon after this letter of hers to me, she died.

Her story illustrates bitterly the disadvantage at which all merely professional people—lawyers, doctors, administrators, and so forth—were without S.P.S.L. to help them through the barricades of official delay. It took the Jewish organization at Woburn House and the Home Office six months between them to issue a visa for a distinguished woman for whom a home was waiting in the U.S.A.—four months after I had written a special letter to the Under-Secretary at the Home Office urging expedition.

Edith Speer was one only of a number of cases coming to me at that time, of non-academics whom we could not help.

There was Prochownik, a judge of the Hanseatic Court of Appeal,

regarding himself as far more important and more learned than a professor and indignant that we would not help him.

There was H. Von Zeissl, for eighteen years head of the University Department of the Ministry of Education in Vienna, specially responsible for the Faculties of Law and Theology and the Ministerial Libraries. But alas! he was not only non-academic and non-Aryan through one Jewish grandparent. He was also non-Jewish, his family having been Catholic for generations. There would be no use in asking the Jewish Professional Committee to help him. Yet he was now at the end of his resources.

There was Hugo Mueller, for twenty-five years to 1935 in a bank at Prague ending as under-manager, and after that Professor of Economics in a technical high school there.

I am 56 years old, not well off and although I have been a Roman Catholic for a long time I am of Jewish origin. It is this latter which forces me to make this request and at the same time makes quite superfluous any further reason for it. My literary activity was not great, but my book 'Wechselkurs und Gueterpreise,' Jena 1926, has been translated into Japanese. . . .

I know very well what it means to seek an existence in England today and I also know that I can scarcely hope to find work in my own profession. But I have no choice and I would take anything, even outside of my profession, that can support my family or, for the first time, only myself in the most modest way. My wife who is Aryan and could therefore stay here for a short time, would be able to help me in every way. She would be apt to earn money as well as I and even very much better on account of her great talent for organization and work, her energy and very practical mind.

My son emigrated a short time ago to Bolivia. My 20 year old daughter is still with us and she too is trying to leave the country. . . .

There was Dr. Stöhr, a musicologist from Vienna, whom I referred to the Jewish Professional Committee, but they told him that with 16,000 musicians unemployed in Britain they saw no chance of permission for him to work here. Fortunately, as one of his friends told me, he had an invitation from the U.S.A. to give sixteen months of lectures there.

Another Austrian musician, Dr. Friedmann, in the like case, with a permit for the U.S.A. and a job there, was looking for a home in England till he could make the journey. I was out of action at the moment, but my secretary, on advice, tried a friend living in Oxford

and received a charming reply. The friend would have been most happy to house Dr. Friedmann, as he had done before with another Austrian musician. But he had just taken in a Basque boy, and he was expecting a Jewish refugee boy from Breslau as soon as the boy could get out of Germany.

We were right, I am sure, to concentrate our own efforts on a special task—of enabling university scholars to continue their service to learning. But we were reminded often that we covered a small fraction only of the refugee problem.

4. Special Tasks of Troubled Peace

Apart from the Allocation Committee from 1934 to 1938, my personal work for refugees was largely one of special jobs.

My connection, for instance, with the greatest figure of modern Britain, when, at the beginning of his Ministerial career, he had launched trade boards, labour exchanges, and unemployment insurance, made me a natural emissary to him when anything special was needed for academic refugees. My first such mission to Winston Churchill was to persuade him as Chancellor of the University of Bristol to sign with the other university chancellors the appeal of March 1935 for the Academic Assistance Council. This needed no persuasion; Churchill was ready to sign, as soon as he knew that Baldwin and Halifax had signed already.

My second mission came late in 1936—to ask him to make the good-cause appeal which Reith had allotted to us for February 28th, 1937. In this purpose I failed, in spite of my argument that the Council was in essence a specialized labour exchange and that he was the father of labour exchanges.

But in my attempt on Winston Churchill I experienced something that I shall never forget. I went to the House of Commons to see him and, while waiting there, I heard him make one of his attacks on the Chamberlain Government for lack of war preparation. It seemed to me then the finest speech I had ever heard or was likely to hear. He was supported by nobody then, save Archibald Sinclair (now Lord Thurso). This was one of the speeches which brought him to our rescue in May of 1940.

In the letter that I sent to Winston Churchill after hearing him speak I wrote: 'I am asking you (a) because an immense number of people will start in to listen to you; (b) because more people will

go on listening to you to the end than to almost anyone I can think of. You would enable us, therefore, to save many more people than we should be able to help otherwise.' This was a letter from the heart. But in the end I had to make the broadcast myself, on February 28th, 1937, and all that came in answer to my appeal was £614 in 530 separate contributions. Money to help German professors did not come easily from the general public, or from anyone save the universities and their staff.

In the same year, 1936, I found myself asked by the Archbishop of Canterbury's Secretary, Dr. Don,¹ to advise the Archbishop on a tricky problem put to him from France. A Committee for the Protection of Persecuted Jewish Intellectuals, that had established itself in France, felt that Hitler's action, since Nuremberg at least, was ground for barring Germany from the League. They invited the Archbishop as head of our Church, to support this view. The Archbishop, knowing well both myself and my interest in this problem of persecution, consulted me. I answered Dr. Don as follows:

15th April 1936.

Many thanks for your letter enclosing a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury from the French Committee for the Protection of Persecuted Jewish Intellectuals. It raises, of course, a rather difficult question.

The treatment accorded by the German Government to Jews, to all persons of liberal opinions and to the organised Churches, is I imagine in the opinion of many besides myself contrary to the principles which should govern civilised society. If I held a position on the League which would compel me to express a definite view as to the admission of Germany to the League I should at least consider the bearing of the Covenant on the action of Germany in these respects. But similar treatment in Russia of intellectuals and of religious organisations has not barred Russia from the League, and slavery has not barred Abyssinia from the League. That being so, one would obviously get into very difficult juridical arguments in supporting the line proposed by the French Committee.

I am pretty sure that the Academic Assistance Council, for instance, would not consider it their business to associate themselves with the French Committee on this matter and I think that the Archbishop might well say that it is not part of the duties of any of his positions to do so.

In the next year, 1937, a very sad task came to me. Lord Rutherford, our President, died on October 19th and we had to find a successor.

Rutherford had been an ideal first President, emphasizing the

¹ Dean of Westminster from 1946 to 1959.

international character of science and learning. All countries were to be alike to us, and all political systems. In one of his first utterances our President Rutherford laid it down that we had no politics. Our business was not to attack any political system. Our business was to help scientists and scholars to continue their learning and teaching in another country, if the rulers of their own country made free work there impossible.

Rutherford had been also a very active President, far from a figurehead only. He took the Chair regularly at meetings of the Council. He could and did help us with personal knowledge of men who were in need of rescue.

To find a successor as President was far from easy. Our first idea was to get Stanley Baldwin—then Chancellor of the University of Cambridge. This idea was put to me by Walter Adams and seemed a good one. I wrote to Baldwin and received a letter from him which I shall always cherish for its kindness, coming as it did from a statesman who hardly knew me. He thought that we ought to have another academic leader like Rutherford; he had doctor's orders which precluded any new task. This second reason had to be accepted.

After taking time to consider alternatives, the Executive Committee decided to invite William Temple, then Archbishop of York, to be our President and he accepted on January 12, 1938. He told us that, having regard to his other duties, he could not promise attendance at our meetings. But he came more often than we had any ground for hoping. And he gave us always any special help we needed. Our cause was his.

Another special job, by no means exclusively mine, was keeping in touch with the Jewish Refugee Organizations. From the large funds that they raised for refugees generally, they contributed to our work regularly and generously. This brought to me much pleasant co-operation with Israel Sieff, who became an early member of our Executive Committee and chairman of a campaign committee. He gave us at once a large personal gift for our work. He and I found ourselves sharing many opinions, including some about other organizers of relief. And when I suggested to him that, to help the proposed Hebrew University in Palestine, we should ask William Temple as Archbishop to chair a fund-raising dinner at the Dorchester, I liked his answer by return: 'I will consult my wife.' Happily consultation led to consent and the dinner was duly held, early in 1939.

The outstanding special task for us, as persecution grew, was to keep going financially. In the first half of 1938 we had come to the conclusion that a special appeal must be organized. When, through Walter Adams's appointment to the London School of Economics and Political Science, we had to find a new paid secretary for S.P.S.L., we looked for someone with experience of organizing appeals, and our choice fell on David Cleghorn Thomson, who had experience of raising money for the University of Oxford. He joined our staff in July 1938, organized an appeal from October to December, and put it through in the first months of 1939.

It was the most successful of all our appeals. Its success was due, I think, to two reasons: first, that our new Secretary was a good man for this job; second, that in 1938 the world had awakened to the refugee problem, as never before.¹

Our appeal of this time had an unusual interest for me, in that I was a spectator only. I had given much time and thought to the many problems of A.A.C.-S.P.S.L. hitherto, and I expected to do the same in our new venture of 1939. Actually, for a purely personal reason, I did nothing at all. A germ called *Streptococcus viridans* descended on me in September 1938 and kept me in bed till the end of December, at one time dangerously ill, in the Acland Home at Oxford. After that came a month of convalescence in Droitwich and in Surrey, so that I returned to normal life in Oxford only at the end of January 1939.

In a spirit of unjustified optimism I had been made Chairman of the Executive Appeal Committee in November 1938, and I hoped against hope continually but in vain that I would be able to take part in at least one of the lectures plus meetings in university cities during February that launched the appeal. The list of these lectures and meetings, which I give in Appendix 3 with their speakers and chairmen, illustrates both the completeness of our organization and the support that we could command.

And the money came rolling in, particularly from academic bodies, on an unprecedented scale. According to a list sent to me at the end of April, we had contributions of £1,000 each from two colleges (Balliol, Oxford, and St. John's, Cambridge), of £500 each or more from three colleges (Trinity, Cambridge; Jesus, Cambridge; and St. John's, Oxford), with many lesser sums from other colleges or universities. We had from firms or individuals 9 gifts ranging

¹ See pp. 31-32.

from £100 to £500, 13 gifts of £50 or more, 19 of £20 or more. In some ways most important of all, we had many annual subscriptions.

Success of our own appeal of February 1939 was the more welcome because we failed to get nearly as much as we had hoped from other appeals for refugees, made at that time by others. We had counted on a large grant from the £480,000 of the Stanley Baldwin Fund, but in the end received £4,000 only and wrote a letter of great disappointment to the authority responsible for distribution of the fund.

As later chapters show, our appeal of February 1939 was the last that, till now, our Society has needed to make. The outbreak of war in September 1939 transformed our financial situation completely. On the one hand, our income increased, when H.M. Government as from September 1939 onwards, repaid to us part of our expenditure; this was the work of the Central Office for Refugees under the Chairmanship of Sir Herbert Emerson. On the other hand, our expenditure fell, as more and more of those on our register found paid employment and established themselves as British citizens. Our increase of income was temporary; the Central Office Grants ended in 1950. Our decline of expenditure has lasted till now.

5. The Heidelberg Celebration of 1936

Early in 1936 it was announced from Germany that the oldest of the German universities, that of Heidelberg, proposed in that year to celebrate the 550th anniversary of her foundation and would like the universities of other countries to take part in the celebrations. This invitation led to vigorous controversy in Britain, begun by the Bishop of Durham in a letter to *The Times* of February 4th, opposing any participation by British universities—having regard to the way in which Heidelberg and the other German universities were persecuting scholars on racial grounds. He was supported among others by Edwyn Bevan from New College and Sir Frederick Gowland Hopkins.

The opposite view was expressed by Sir Josiah Stamp, H. W. Nevinson, and Sir Ian Hamilton among others; the two last of these urged that our treatment of Germany in the Versailles Treaty was responsible for the rise of Hitler; Sir Ian Hamilton, in a second letter, begged the British universities, before they cut connection

with the German universities, to go and see for themselves what the latter were doing.

The debate raged nearly continuously in *The Times* from February 4th to 29th. Naturally I could not resist coming in myself, near the end, in support of the Bishop of Durham. There was no need, I said, to visit Germany to discover how the universities there were acting. Our own universities should neglect no opportunity of scientific collaboration with individuals in Germany, and should remain as hospitable as ever to German students. 'But we should feel insincere in visiting on terms of friendship the German Universities which, willingly or unwillingly, have driven into exile so many of our academic colleagues, and, willingly or unwillingly, have departed so far from spiritual freedom.'

Though I did not say so in this letter, I felt at the time that it would be out of place for our universities to join in the Heidelberg celebration, because it was a political rather than an academic affair. Why should a university founded in 1386, with five centuries behind it, celebrate its 550th anniversary? The answer was plain as a pike-staff. The University of Heidelberg in 1936 was something utterly different from what it had been till 1933 and was inviting us to applaud the change. My judgement of the affair was confirmed in full by the celebrations themselves on June 27 to 29 of 1936, and by the Rektor and Goebbels when they spoke there.

Five years before, in 1931, with a large grant of money from America secured for it by the former American Ambassador, Dr. Schurman, Heidelberg had completed a new University building, and had inscribed over the entrance as motto 'To the Eternal Spirit' under an effigy of Pallas Athene. By 1936 this had been replaced by 'To the German Spirit' under a golden swastika; Pallas Athene was hidden in a cupboard. The public celebrations, as *The Times* recorded,¹ took the form of a political demonstration, with students marching through the town as Nazi storm troopers, with hardly an academic robe to be seen.

¹ I owe everything said here about the actual celebrations at Heidelberg to *The Times* of June 26, 1936. Its report—most of a column—contains many other interesting things and is well worth reading as a whole. A collection of Heidelberg letters was printed later as a pamphlet on *The Heidelberg Celebration and the Universities of America* (Viking Press, New York). It adds to the letters a magnificent article by A. V. Hill, Gowland Hopkins, and Frederic Kenyon, which appeared in the *Universities Review* in April 1936, and can have left few people with any doubt as to the rightness of the line taken by British universities.

The celebration began on the night of June 27 with the public hoisting of the flags of 32 countries whose universities and colleges had sent delegations. The flag of Great Britain was missing. The British universities, one and all, had stayed away from the Heidelberg University of 1936. None of the British Dominion universities were there in person, except the Union of South Africa.

3. The Society at Work in World War II. 1939-45

1. Four Immediate Changes through War

THE OUTBREAK OF WORLD WAR II on September 3rd, 1939, changed the life and work of the Society for the Protection of Science and Learning, as it changed other lives, in several important ways.

First, and most obvious, came a change of locality. London under bombing was no place for work that could be done anywhere else. The office of the Society was removed from London to its birth-place Cambridge, where it was housed first in a set of rooms in King's College for two months, then in the Scott Institute for Polar Research for two years, and then next door to the Cambridge Appointments Board, in Lensfield House. In the spring of 1940 the more important records and documents of the Society were sent for safety to Cornwall.

The transfer of our office to Cambridge involved a change of official duties. I had become a Vice-President in 1938, as has been told above, in order to make place for Walter Adams as one of the two honorary secretaries. But, though living in Oxford since 1937, I had continued to be Chairman of our Allocation Committee dealing with individual cases; so long as the office was in London, I could and did frequent it regularly.

But an office at Cambridge was a different pair of boots. The two ancient universities of England are each nearer to London than they are to one another. I ceased to be Chairman of allocations. A new committee, described as the Cambridge Allocation Committee, was established under the Chairmanship of Sir John Clapham and did admirably. Two of its reports, for 1940 and 1942, are cited below to illustrate the human work of the Society in war as in peace.

With a change of honorary officers came also a change in the paid office of secretary. Walter Adams's successor, Cleghorn Thomson, had been appointed with a special task in view—that of organizing

a national appeal for money—and had been appointed, in the first instance, for a year. As the year drew to a close, with his special task excellently fulfilled—and the world changing round them—neither the Society nor he felt certain that the secretaryship would be his natural permanent career. He had a variety of interests and experiences. So he was reappointed, in the first instance, till the end of October only and, in the most friendly way, he told the Society in good time that he did not wish to go on after that. The Society took the natural course of appointing as Secretary from November 1st, 1939, Miss Esther Simpson, who had served them so faithfully from the first year of all.

Second came a change in the status of refugees. The Germans, Austrians, and Italians among them were now 'enemy aliens' and were required in October 1939 to appear before tribunals set up to examine and classify them under three headings. Category A was for 'dangerous enemies'; they were imprisoned forthwith. Category C was for harmless refugees. Category B was for those as to whom there might be some doubt.

Some of the magistrates forming the tribunals seem not to have grasped just what they had to do; as a result, in some parts of the country (generally small parts) all refugees, whether men or women, were put into Category B. But in general the tribunals functioned reasonably and dealt kindly with our academics. At the Executive Committee meeting of February 8, 1940, a pleasant task of the new Secretary was to report that almost all the scholars registered with the Society had been freed by the tribunals from all restrictions. In the cases where the restrictions had not been removed a further inquiry was to be made which would probably lead to a favourable revision. The Society had heard of only two internments of refugee scholars, apart from one who had been arrested in mistake and subsequently released.

February 1940 was a month of twilight war.

Third, came a change of the Government's attitude to refugees. They accepted at last the thesis which some of us, with the help of Geoffrey Dawson and *The Times*, had been urging on them since the spring of 1939—that the refugee problem had become too large to be dealt with by voluntary organizations and charitable money. They set up in January 1940 a Central Committee for Refugees

under the distinguished Chairmanship of Sir Herbert Emerson, the League of Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, to administer a government grant to voluntary organizations caring for refugees from Nazi oppression.

The grant was to be pound for pound of what the voluntary organizations spent from their own resources. It was promised in the first instance for six months from January 1940, subject to a maximum of £20,000 a month in total; for the four months of war from September to December 1939 there would be a retrospective contribution of £100,000. In effect government money for refugees began with World War II and went on for nearly five years after war had ended, to March 31, 1950.

As soon as the Executive Committee of S.P.S.L. discussed the Government's offer, at our meeting of February 8, 1940, we realized that we might find difficulty in getting as much money as we should like to have. So, after a preliminary talk between Sir Herbert and myself, we sent Miss Nancy Searle to put our case to the Central Committee as a whole on March 13th, 1940. As a result I received two days later from Herbert Emerson a letter clearly designed to open the way to treating us as generously as his powers allowed, and to overcome technical difficulties in doing so. He began by saying that Miss Searle had put our case very well and that the Committee greatly appreciated the work we were doing.

But there were difficulties which he went on to explain. One difficulty was that the Government grant was limited to refugees from Germany or Austria, whereas we helped scholars from other countries also. Another difficulty was the size of our grants. The Central Committee, under Government instructions, without being rigidly bound to scales of public relief to British subjects, were required to take these scales into account. Our grants were at a much higher level; we argued that scholars must be maintained in a condition to make their contribution to the national effort. Our grants, again, were to heads of families including dependants, while the Committee were bound to reckon in terms of individuals. Herbert Emerson kindly suggested that it would be in the Society's interest to make claims in his Committee's way rather than our own way; we should get more money out of him. To make this easy he sent us a claim form of his own devising.

The Government grant was not limited to direct relief. It provided also for a proportion of the administrative expenses of the voluntary

organizations undertaking relief. This raised a difficulty with us, in so far as our administration dealt with refugees not only from Germany and Austria, but from other countries like Czechoslovakia, Spain, and Portugal. Herbert Emerson decided to ignore this difficulty in regard to costs of administration. 'For the present, at any rate, the total expenditure will be taken as ranking for claim, subject of course to the understanding, which is general, that the Committee may, at any time, question, for the purpose of the Government grant, the general level of administrative costs or expenditure on particular items.'

In practice, from September 1939 onwards, the Society continued to draw a substantial income from the Government. With this and the growing opportunities for employment of its scholars the Society did not find itself in financial difficulties again.

In the first three years of war the Society received on an average more than £2,000 a year of government grant. Thereafter, with improving employment for refugees, it spent less and asked for less. But in total it received £14,500 from the Government.

A fourth, though less immediate, effect of the war on the position of academic refugees lay in giving increased opportunities for their employment.

Offers of service by them were not accepted at first and till 1943 the Army was not open to voluntary enlistment by them, except in the Pioneer Corps. But many enlisted in this Corps and were transferred later to other branches of the Army, chiefly Intelligence, Signals, or the R.A.M.C.

The year 1941 saw the placing in employment of most of the refugee scholars in Britain, generally in their own field of studies. But there were many cases of middle-aged and elderly men of the arts faculties who, after training, did a period of work in munitions factories. One distinguished art historian worked for some months in clearing debris after the heavy raids on London. The account of those scholars who worked in their own field and the distinctions which they gained are reserved for my final chapter on The Folly of Tyrants.

In March 1942 the Secretary presented a table to us showing that, of 549 academic refugees registered with us in Britain, only 43 were known to be unemployed; 227 were working in universities, academic and scientific institutions, or at research in hospitals; 146

were working in industry, commerce, private medical and law practice, general practitioners in hospitals, journalists, and so on.

By September 1944 most of the refugee scholars in Britain were placed, and the number still being maintained by the Society was only 22. Most of these 22 were too old or too ill to get paid employment.

2. General Internment of May 1940

A fifth consequence of war on academic refugees and on their treatment in Britain has been kept to the last, marking as it did the passage from twilight war to desperate war.

At the Executive Committee meeting of February 6, 1940, Miss Margery Fry, returning from a visit to France, had told us how full that country was of refugees—400,000 Spaniards, 42,000 Germans and Austrians, and many Poles and Czechs. The Poles were proposing to start a Polish University in Paris. Others concerned for the welfare of refugees were planning to establish a centre in Paris where intellectual refugees of all races and kinds would meet; the Scotch College at Montpellier seemed to them an excellent building for the purpose. Such a scheme, said Miss Fry, would be greatly advanced if a contribution towards its cost could be promised by our Society. The Executive Committee were duly impressed by Miss Fry: in principle they were prepared to set aside £500 as a contribution to this centre in Paris, and they did so.

That was how things looked in February of 1940. Three months later, after Denmark and Norway had been overrun by Hitler, the Battle of France began—to be decided swiftly against France—and the British Government was changed, with Winston Churchill coming in as Prime Minister at the head of a National Coalition. There followed for our Society a surprising experience. Nearly all our academic refugees were enemy aliens and most of them were males. On May 12th general internment was decreed for all men and women in Category B wherever they were living, and for all men enemy aliens, whatever their category, residing along the east coast of Britain or within a certain distance from it. The decree was carried out promptly. Practically all our 500-odd academic refugees from Germany, Austria, and Italy disappeared overnight. Three examples, from my personal correspondence of that time, are sufficient to show what this meant in particular cases.

All Souls College at Oxford found Frank Burchardt who had been a Fellow since 1936 interned. Hans Rhee, born in Germany of a Dutch father and German mother, though thereafter he lost property, wealth, and nationality in struggling against Hitler, and spent most of his time in Holland and England, found himself interned after six years of study and life in Oxford, varied by social work among the unemployed in Glamorgan and among the Basques in Somerset. Leo Liepmann, who had worked for me for years on Wage and Price History, was swept off to the Isle of Man; when I protested, I was told that Liepmann had presumably acquired dangerous economic knowledge about prices which he might give away to Hitler who had expelled him.

Our experience was a tiny part only of what was happening to all the Germans, Austrians, and Italians who had taken refuge in Britain from their tyrants. Our academics were about one in fifty of all the internees on this occasion.

As was explained by the Home Secretary, John Anderson, in the second of the debates¹ which the House of Commons devoted to alien internment during 1940, the policy at the outbreak of war had been to intern, among enemy aliens, only those as to whose loyalty to us doubt was felt, after inquiry by tribunals, and, in the result, only a small proportion were interned. After the invasion of Holland, Belgium, and France, with invasion threatening us at our doors, a policy of general internment was adopted. We could take no risk of leaving at large anyone who might help the enemy if he landed in Britain.

As was stated in the last of the 1940 debates² by a new Home Secretary, Herbert Morrison, between 26,000 and 27,000 men were interned under this policy of May, and over 19,000 remained interned in December. They were not by any means all in Britain. It had been felt important to relieve the country of as many aliens as possible, in view of invasion risk. Many had been deported accordingly to the care of the Dominion governments in Canada and Australia. The largest collection left here was in the Isle of Man.

Herbert Morrison in December justified the general internment of May as reflecting the overwhelming feeling at that time of the House, but was met by shouts of 'No'. Very few people had thought to spare for refugees in May and June. By July the nature of the

¹ July 23, 1940.

² December 3, 1940.

internment policy was becoming clear and caused much perturbation in the House of Commons.

It was the subject not only of many questions about individual refugees but of four debates: on the adjournment of July 10th, at the end of questions on July 23rd, on the summer adjournment of August 22nd, on the Address in reply to the King's Speech on December 3. Three of these debates ran for 6, 3½, and 4 hours respectively—nearly 14 hours of parliamentary time devoted to the interests of enemy aliens in the year of greatest danger that Britain had ever known.

The unofficial speakers, of all parties, in these debates were nearly all hostile to what the Government had done—most notably Eleanor Rathbone (Independent, English Universities) and Major Cazalet (Conservative, Chippenham), followed by Viscount Wolmer (Conservative, Aldershot) in the first debate and by A. V. Hill (Independent, Cambridge University), Graham White (Liberal, Birkenhead), and Josiah Wedgwood (Labour, Newcastle-under-Lyme) on more than one occasion. The Government had, of course, supporters, typified by Mrs. Tate of Frome with her advice to intern first and inquire afterwards, but such supporters were very few. The critics admitted that the country's danger in May called for the strongest possible measures for security; for that reason, as Eleanor Rathbone explained in the first debate, she had waited to criticize internment till July when the danger seemed less; she urged now that prolongation of largely indiscriminate internment was contrary to all that Britain stood for, and was bringing her into disrepute.¹ 'Indiscriminate internment', said the opener of the December debate—Latham from Sheffield—'brought to light evidence of what looked like double persecution, first by the Nazis and Fascists, and secondly by ourselves.' 'Home Secretaries', Wedgwood followed him, 'think they are responsible for law, order and security. They are; but they are responsible for something more than law, order and security. They are responsible for the traditions and honour of our country more than any other Minister, and it is only by balancing those two duties, security and the old decencies of English culture and law, that we can win through.'²

¹ Nazi broadcasters, as Major Cazalet pointed out, declared that Britain was interning all Jews.

² December 3, 1940, *Hansard*, 1940, vol. 367, col. 438, for Latham and cols. 465–6 for Wedgwood.

Herbert Morrison, answering in the fourth debate with nearly 20,000 men still interned five months later, had a sticky time. He felt the deportation to Canada and Australia to be the stickiest point of all. It had been 'a rushed business'. Deportation was one of the special points of attack—by Eleanor Rathbone—in the first debate of all on July 10. Deportation, unfortunately, had been the fate of some of the most distinguished internees, such as F. G. Friedlander, a mathematician who gained the unique distinction of being elected a Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, while he was imprisoned in Canada. Deportation led also to the disaster of the *Arandora Star* sunk by a German submarine on July 3, 1940, with 1,500 German, Austrian, and Italian internees aboard; most of them as well as of the crew were drowned. As no displaced scholar seems to have been included, I need not discuss here the much-disputed question as to how the deportees for this ill-fated journey came to be chosen and what kind of men they were.

The Commons naturally were concerned with refugees generally rather than with the small class of academic refugees, 530 out of a total internment of 27,000. But, fortunately, the interest of academic refugees was admirably represented in the Commons by A. V. Hill of Cambridge. John Anderson, in the first debate of all, on July 10, had promised to exempt from internment men who in inquiry were found free from suspicion on personal grounds and could do work of national importance. A week later, on July 17, A. V. Hill put a question asking whether the Home Secretary would regard 'contributions of significance to science and learning' as nationally important. With John Anderson answering: 'Yes, Sir', the way was open for rescue of academic refugees.

The way was taken at once. From early August onwards I found myself getting letters from Miss Simpson of S.P.S.L. about men personally known to me, like Burchardt and Friedrich Hertz, asking if I could vouch for their personal integrity and loyalty to this country, as of course I could. The learned societies in Britain—Royal Society, British Academy, Royal Society of Medicine—set up special tribunals of their own to report individually on interned scholars; the work of S.P.S.L., in the summer and autumn of 1940, was concentrated on preparing cases for these tribunals and applying for release of those refugee scholars on our register whose cases were approved by the tribunals. The preparation of these cases was yet another illustration of the readiness of our members and staff to

be unsparing of themselves in helping individual scholars under duress. Each case involved making a biography of the refugee as complete as possible, in order to refute suggestions that he was a Nazi in disguise; we were asked to deal not only with scholars on our own register but also with other intellectual and professional refugees. The Society today has four large volumes of these biographies, closely typed, representing months of work, a monument of the waste of time that war involved, over and above the obvious waste in slaughter.

Happily the four volumes are a monument also to success. Five hundred and eighteen applications in all were prepared by the Society in this way, only twenty were refused, and none of the twenty were scholars on our own list. For academic refugees the government policy was admitted in practice to have been absurd. 'This work of securing the release of scholars and scientists able and willing to assist in the war effort in their various ways was of benefit to the nation as well as to the refugees.'¹

But the way to this achievement was desperately slow. The high-spot of the fourth House of Commons debate, on December 3rd, 1940, was in the speech made then by A. V. Hill. He had spent nearly four months in collecting particulars of interned academics, to get them released, and he came armed to the teeth with insults to hurl at the Government.

No doubt, he said, internment of possible enemies had been necessary, but why must the Government be so absolutely indiscriminate? The scholars and scientists who had taken refuge in this country since 1933 were for the most part well known to their colleagues here. A question to any of these colleagues would have been answered immediately, and would have brought in most cases exemption or release from internment.

Why again was the procedure for examining applications for release so appallingly slow? A letter from an internee in the Isle of Man had taken forty-two days to reach the Royal Society in London. A. V. Hill, having an exact mind, calculated the letter's rate of travel as a quarter of a mile per hour, or less than the speed of a tortoise.

Why again must a first-class civil engineer known to everybody have to wait for five months in internment, before his case could even be referred by the Home Secretary to an Advisory Committee?

¹ Fifth Report of S.P.S.L., p. 5.

This engineer, no doubt, was Professor Enrico Volterra from Italy. Interned in June, Volterra had been recommended for release by the Royal Society in August, but was still in prison three months after. He had recently been offered again the very important post in the Argentine which he had refused once in order to come to England. He wanted to stay in England in order to assist our war effort, but he was coming to think that work in the Argentine was preferable to indefinite internment, even in England.¹

All this delay meant waste of brains badly needed by war-time Britain. To Volterra, A. V. Hill added several examples. One was that of a first-class anatomist who became a key-member of a wound-healing team at the Strangeways Research Laboratory; his internment and deportation held up the work of the team for months. Next came a biologist who had taught as a master in an English public school till interned; on release after many months he had not been allowed back to the job—kept open for him by the school—and was now subsisting on the charity of S.P.S.L. Next came a doctor who, taking refuge here in 1933, obtained the B.M. qualification and was on the point of naturalization in 1938; on the outbreak of war in 1939 he resigned the practice he had built up, in order to join the Emergency Medical Service for whom he worked in a hospital till May 1940; he had been interned on May 12 and released on November 5 with return to the Emergency Medical Service prohibited and his practice gone. He had nothing now to live on and he was forbidden to help us in our need.

By the end of 1940 practically all the interned academic refugees had been released, and a substantial start had been made on other internees. Among other things Alexander Paterson had been sent to Canada to pick out 400 deportees, to be shipped home for service in the Pioneer Corps. He did his work admirably, and the journey back of the first 280, under comfortable conditions without guards, was long remembered with gratitude.

But the interest of the House of Commons in the fate of internees did not end in 1940. There followed on February 25, 1941, yet a fifth debate, concerned this time with the treatment of refugees on the way to Australia, in S.S. *Dunera*. According to the opener of the debate, Josiah Wedgwood, about 2,400 Jewish refugees, mostly graded C as friendly to Britain, were deported in a ship suited to

¹ He is now (1958) Professor in the Department of Mechanics of the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute at Troy in New York State.

half that number, were battered down and robbed by the soldiers in charge. The treatment in other ships, though uncomfortable, was quite different; the report on the *Dunera* voyage made by a Committee of the Society of Friends had received much publicity in Australia and produced a very creditable reaction there. Wedgwood's opening speech was supported by members of other parties and received a friendly reception from the Government, promising to make things better for the refugees in future. Today one can say only that when a stupid decision is made in war, stupid men will make it worse in execution.

Two years later, on May 19, 1943, came yet a sixth debate, in a new atmosphere, produced by Hitler's systematic massacre of Jews. This debate arose on a motion to which 276 members had subscribed their names two months before. In so far as it attacked the Government, it attacked them not for what they had done, as in the case of internment and deportation of refugees, but for what they seemed not to be doing to save Hitler's victims from him. The motion brought yet another notable speech from A. V. Hill, pleading that we should do everything in our power to offer asylum from massacre. We should not be held back by fear of rousing anti-Semitic feeling in our own country.

The internment and deportation of so many refugees in Britain during World War II is not mentioned by the leader who brought us victory then, in the many-volumed history of that war with which he has enriched us. Such an omission is intelligible, having regard to the vast scope which that history must cover. But this internment episode and the reaction to it of so many independent citizens are part of British history and an illumination of British character; it caused five debates in our House of Commons in less than eight months of desperate war. No excuse is needed for putting episode and reaction fully on record here. They are well worth thinking over today—for three distinct reasons.

First, the record recalls the desperate danger in which Britain appeared to be in May 1940.

Second, the record shows how swiftly the sense of danger passed, and the British, typified by their Members of Parliament, returned to their political traditions, felt general internment as carried out to be un-British, and spent energy in discussing that, rather than their own prospects of survival. Were they being merely stupid in

their self-confidence? Or was their self-confidence the underlying secret of their survival?

Third, the record shows the strength of the British sentiment of kindness to refugees from oppression. This was illustrated in two ways by the Under-Secretary of State for the Home Office, Osbert Peake, in replying on the third debate, of August 22.

One illustration arose from the number of letters written to the internees. One hundred and twenty thousand letters a week were going to them. 'All these friends', Mr. Peake added ruefully, 'seem to be writing either to me or to members of Parliament.'

Mr. Peake's other illustration was the tribute paid by the internees themselves to the British officers in charge of them in the Isle of Man. 'There is not one amongst us who will not remember them in days to come with lasting gratitude.' The account of his experiences which I give in the next chapter, from one of the Isle of Man internees, Dr. Leo Liepmann, confirms this tribute completely.

3. Practical Help to Individuals Continues

The internment policy of May 1940, in relation to academic refugees, was a tiresome incident in our Society's history, using energy needed for other tasks. It did not stop our practical work.

The Cambridge Allocation Committee under Sir John Clapham, meeting for the first time on October 27th, 1939, carried on the tradition of untiring examination of individual needs that they had helped to make in London. They met much more often than their London prototype, with 49 formally recorded meetings in the four years 1939 to 1943, against 16 meetings of my London committee in the five years from 1933 to 1939. This enabled them to avoid the almost interminable meetings of the London committee, running once to five hours, and to make certain that each individual case was considered fully. With different procedure and smaller membership in regular attendance their spirit was the same—that of using as little money and as much thought as they could, to give the maximum of help and secure the maximum of co-operation from other agencies. And, subject to interesting differences, some arising from war as against peace, and others from lapse of time, their task was broadly the same.

The similarities of our work between peace and war can be

illustrated best by a selection of individual cases coming before our Allocation Committee at Cambridge in war time. I have taken for this purpose two meetings of the Committee in February 1940 and March 1942 respectively. From the 200 or so cases which came before the Committee then I have selected 32, omitting names, as in the similar selections given in Chapter 2 for September 1938 and May 1939, and adding in italics the present position so far as we know it, of each individual scholar.

One of the main differences between peace and war—the greater range of countries from which displaced scholars came to us—is shown in detail in Table 1 that is printed on p. 66 covering 207 cases. The broad result of this table is summarized with it. Subject to representing each of the 10 countries from which our grantees of February 1940 and March 1942 came, my selection of 32 recorded individually has been almost haphazard.

To an Art Historian from Belgium, grant at £200 a year for thirteen months from August 1940 for research at Windsor Castle. *Now professor in the University of Brussels.*

To a Physicist from Germany, grant at £150 a year for three months from February 1st, 1940, for continuation of research at Solar Physics Laboratory, Cambridge, grant to be increased to £200 a year if his family are able to join him.¹

To three scientists from Spain, with Bacteriology, Radiology, and Neurology as their subjects, loans of £35 to £40 towards expenses of emigration to Mexico. *All three are now working in Mexico in Biological or Medical Laboratories or elsewhere.*

To a Physicist from the U.S.S.R., maintenance grant at £120 a year for three months from December 1st, 1939, while he continues private research. *Now dead.*

To a Musicologist from Austria, research grant at £150 a year for three months if necessary from January 1st, 1940, for continuation of work on biography of Schubert. *Now retired in Vienna. Has published several books on musicology in recent years. A renowned authority on Schubert.*

To a Philologist from Czechoslovakia, research grant at £250 a year for six months from November 1st, 1939, for research at Oslo

¹ A later entry in 1942 suggests that his family were not able to join him, but he continued to receive £150 a year made up in part by money raised specially for him by a private friend. *He is now a schoolmaster in Britain.*

University in Norway. *Now Professor of Slavic Languages and Literature at Harvard University.*

To a woman Philosopher from Germany, an earmarked grant of £58 from the Zangwill Memorial Fund was made in April 1941 for publication of a book on Aristotle. *Was on staff of Westfield College, University of London. Now in U.S.A.*

To a Physicist from Czechoslovakia, a grant at £250 a year was made for three and a half months from November 1st, 1940, but in the next Allocation Report was cancelled, on his appointment to a government position in Dublin. Instead he received a loan of £150 for removing his furniture and library to Dublin. *Now professor at the Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies and Member of the Royal Irish Academy.*

To an Engineer from Italy, S.P.S.L. grant at £150 p.a. for six months from 1st March 1940 and again for twelve months from 1st February 1941 for research at Engineering Laboratory, Cambridge. *Now Professor of Engineering, University of Texas.*

To an Historian from Portugal, £200 p.a. for three months from February 1, 1942, for research for Hakluyt Society. *Now on staff of U.N.E.S.C.O.*

To a Mathematician from Czechoslovakia, conversion of grant into allowance of expenses of emigration up to £125 to U.S.A.; he has a post at Louisville. *Now Professor of Mathematics, Stanford University, California.*

To an Economist from Germany, loan of £25 in March 1940 when payment of American Scholarship failed to arrive.

To a woman Classic from Germany, grant at £50 for twenty-four months from October 1, 1940, for research on Corpus Platonicum to supplement £75 from British Academy and £25 from Somerville College, Oxford. *Now with Warburg Institute, University of London.*

To an Economist from Germany, grant at £200 p.a. for continuation of research at Institute of Statistics, Oxford.

To a Pediatrician from Austria, grant of £150 p.a. for three months from January 15, 1940, for research at British Postgraduate Medical School, Hammersmith. *Now dead. Was in private practice in London.*

To a Philosopher and Classical Philologist from Austria, loan of £40 towards expenses of emigration to U.S.A. *Now in library post in New York.*

To a Lawyer from Austria, a grant to supplement hospitality given by the Master of Ridley Hall, Cambridge. *Now dead.*

To a mathematician from Czechoslovakia, grant to supplement money raised by Edinburgh University. *Now Professor of Mathematics, California Institute of Technology.*

To a Biologist from Poland, a grant for research at Edinburgh University. *Now on staff of Medical Research Council, Institute of Animal Genetics, Edinburgh.*

To a woman Physicist from France, a grant to supplement hospitality of Newnham College, Cambridge, during research at the Cavendish Laboratory. *Now on staff of a scientific laboratory in Paris.*

To a Biologist from Austria, in addition to income provided jointly by S.P.S.L. and the Department of Zoology in Edinburgh University, £5. 2s. 0d. as fares for his wife to join him. *Now Scientific Officer with Wool Industries Research Association, Leeds.*

To a Chemist from Austria, £16. 5s. 0d. in March 1940 for legal expenses connected with internment. *Professor of Chemistry, University of Vienna since 1948.*

To a woman Historian from Germany, a grant at £108 a year to make up to a living standard her husband's pay on joining the Pioneer Corps.

To an Art Historian from Italy, a grant for continuation of research for the Vatican Library.¹

To an Archaeologist from Austria, a Chemist from Czechoslovakia, a Musicologist from Spain, and an Economist from Germany, loans in advance of salaries to come to them from posts in the City of Birmingham Technical College, in London University, in the B.B.C., and in Exeter University College respectively.²

To a Physicist from Czechoslovakia in receipt of a grant of £200 from S.P.S.L. for work with Professor Born at Edinburgh, a grant of £6. 6s. 7d. in August to pay his fare from Birmingham to Glasgow to attend an internee tribunal. *Now retired. Was Reader in Physics at Birkbeck College, University of London.*

¹ Originally German, this Art Historian left Germany through racial persecution in 1934, researched in the Vatican from 1934 to 1949, and had a grant from the Warburg Institute 1947-57. He worked always on his own account.

² The archaeologist from Austria is now Reader in Archaeology in the University of Birmingham. The chemist from Czechoslovakia, now dead, was on the staff of University College, Aberystwyth. The musicologist from Spain is living in Spain. The economist from Germany is now dead.

To the wife of a Chemist from Germany, a loan at £150 a year for two months, from August 1st, 1940, during his internment. *He is now head of the Biochemistry Division of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, Adelaide.*

TABLE 1. *Subjects and Countries of Origin of Refugees before Allocation Committee in 1940 and 1942*

	February 1940							March 1942						
	Germany	Austria	Czechoslovakia	Italy	Spain	Other	Total	Germany	Austria	Czechoslovakia	Italy	Spain	Other	Total
Anatomy	1	1	1	1
Astronomy	1	1
Bacteriology	1	1	..	2	1	1
Biochemistry	2	2	1	1
Biology	2	1	1	1	..	Poland 1	6	3	3	2	1	9
Chemistry	1	1	1	..	3	4	3	2	2	1	..	12
Engineering	2	2	1	1
Mathematics	1	1	3	..	2	1	6
Medicine
(internal)	1	2	3	..	1	..	7	2	1	2	..	1	..	6
Neurology	..	1	1	..	2	1	1	2
Otology	1	1	..	1	1
Pathology	1	1	2	1	1	2
Pediatrics	..	2	2	1	1
Pharmacology	1	1	..	1	1
Physics	2	1	2	..	1	U.S.S.R. 1	7	4	3	5	..	2	France 1	15
Physiology	1	1	1	..	3
Psychology	1	1	4	4
Radiology	1	..	1
SCIENCE TOTAL	15	7	8	3	6	2	41	27	14	13	6	6	1	67
Anthropology	1	1	2
Archaeology	..	1	1	2	2	2	4
Art History	4	4	8	3	1	1	..	Belgium 1	14
Classics	1	1	2	2
Economics	..	1	2	3	2	1	1	4
Education	1	1	1	1
History	3	1	4	3	2	1	4	..	Portugal 1	11
Law	..	2	2	3	3	6
Musicology	2	..	2	2	2
Philology:
Classic	1	..	1	1	1	1
German	1	6	2	..	2	4
Oriental	2	2	2
Philosophy	1	2	3	6	4	10
Sinology
Sociology	2	..	1	3	3	1	1	5
ARTS, &c.,
TOTAL	16	6	5	2	2	..	31	34	16	5	9	2	2	68
GRAND TOTAL	31	13	13	5	8	2	72	61	30	18	15	8	3	135

I have put these cases in something like the order which the Allocation Committee used themselves—of straightforward grants,

of grants combined with help from elsewhere, and of payments, sometimes very small, for special purposes. Between them they illustrate the three main similarities of our work in war and in peace: universality of scope of the Society's work in subjects covered and in the countries covered; universality of its co-operation with learned institutions in countries still free; and personal touch, in adjusting help to varied needs. These have been features of everything that the Society and its predecessor attempted throughout the twenty-five years covered by this book.

The two differences between our work in war and in the peace that led to war are the greater variety in war of countries of origin for its refugees and the diminishing financial burden that we had to bear.

As to countries of origin, the attack on free learning had begun in Germany, but, in 1940 and 1942, less than half the cases dealt with by the Allocation Committee came from that country. As against 44 per cent. from Germany, there were 36 per cent. from Austria or Czechoslovakia, and 20 per cent. from Italy, Spain, Portugal, Poland, or other countries not under German occupation. The relative decline of Germany proper as a source of the Society's task reflected two changes: the spread of attack on free learning and the relative success of the Society in finding new homes for refugees from Germany, the country on which they began.

As to the financial burden on the Society, our success in placing refugee scholars in employment even before World War II began went far to meet the growth in total the number of our refugees as persecution spread. The outbreak of war both made it harder for new refugees to reach us and easier for those already here to find paid employment. There resulted for us in the war the transformation of our financial situation that is described briefly in the next paragraphs.

For our first six years, till 1939, we seemed always to be in financial danger. Our Honorary Treasurer put the balance available for further grants at the end of our second financial year (July 31, 1935) at £1,500. Two years later the balance had climbed above £5,000, but by July 31, 1938, it was down again below £4,000. Having regard to the scale of our total liabilities and their tendency to grow as persecution spread, this was living from hand to mouth.

Transformation from this in war-time sprang from two main

sources already named—of better employment for refugees and of government money for refugees. Better employment for our scholars meant not only that our expenditure on grants decreased, but that as they became established, our refugees were a source of financial support to us. Government money for refugees was not only a direct alleviation of our task but it symbolized a public recognition of the refugee problem that helped us in other ways. As has been recorded in the last chapter, we made our first really successful general appeal for funds in February 1939. The appeal put our free balance for further grants up to £6,200 in June of that year, its highest figure till then. But war brought free balances at a different level—more than £10,000 by June 1940 and September 1942, more than £17,000 in September 1944.

As will be recorded in Chapter 5, free balances at this level have continued to the present day. But as will be argued also in that chapter, this does not mean that money for displaced scholars is not needed. It means that physical as distinct from financial rescue of such scholars has become more difficult.

4. Some Experiences of Refugee Scholars in 1940

THREE PAPERS BY THREE REFUGEE SCHOLARS in Britain giving their experiences of internment as enemy aliens, with or without deportation, in World War II are printed below as written by them, with a few omissions marked by dots.

The first of the three papers is by Dr. Leo Liepmann, an economist from Breslau and a leading member of the Society of Friends in Germany. Through two Jewish grandparents he had enough Jewish blood in him to be subject to Hitler's persecution and in 1935 took refuge from Germany in England, where he worked for several years with me on Price and Wage History. Interned in May 1940, he was lucky enough both to fall ill and to meet his wife unexpectedly in another internment camp on the Isle of Man. Illness was held to justify his provisional release in August 1940 and, with his wife, he returned to his Oxford home; in due course he persuaded the authorities to make his release permanent. He is now a British subject living in Oxford. He wrote an account of his experience at my request in July 1958 for publication in this book.

The second paper is by Heinz Arndt, who was a research worker in sociology at the London School of Economics when he was interned and sent to Douglas in the Isle of Man. Being unmarried, though engaged to be married, he was deported from Liverpool to Canada on Motor Ship *Estrick* at the beginning of July. He kept a diary, addressed to his fiancée, throughout his journey from Liverpool to Quebec. Extracts from this were printed in the *Tribune*, a Liberal paper now defunct. In printing extracts here, from the typescript that has come down to me, I have omitted many details about sea-sickness and other discomforts on the crowded ship. Heinz Arndt is now Professor of Economics at Canberra University College in Australia.

The last and shortest of the three papers is by Dr. Glücksmann, an anatomist from the University of Heidelberg. Interned while

working at the Strangeways Research Laboratory in Cambridge, sent to Douglas in the Isle of Man and deported at the beginning of July 1940 from Glasgow to Quebec, in the Polish liner *Sobieski*, he was the first deportee to be brought back from Canada and he wrote in or before September 1940 a memorandum on his experiences, which is printed below. He is now Senior Histologist at the Strangeways Research Laboratory.

1. A Quaker in the Isle of Man

I was interned on May 20th, 1940, in Birmingham, where I lived temporarily as a Fellow of Woodbrooke, the Quaker College. My home was in Oxford and there I was well known and had been classified 'C' by the Aliens Tribunal at the beginning of the war. But in Birmingham I was practically unknown outside a small group of Friends and the Aliens Advisory Committee which was reviewing the classification of refugees in May 1940 was much under the impact of the rapidly mounting success of Hitler's *Blitzkrieg* which had started on May 10th, 1940. Birmingham had a rather large refugee population and the police was inclined to be on the cautious side. When the Advisory Committee heard that I had once written and published a book about the Bank of England and had worked under Sir William (now Lord) Beveridge, it considered me to be a much too dangerous person to be left at liberty and the fact that the book about the Bank of England covered the period 1819-1844 made no difference. I was classified 'B' and interned at once.

Two strong police officers took me to Woodbrooke in a police car, I had to pack a few necessary things into a small suitcase: 'Don't take too much, you will probably be back in a few days, don't make it heavier than you can carry.' Good-bye to friends who were most sympathetic and students in Woodbrooke—Good-bye to my wife and we were on the way again to an unknown destination. My papers and my money—or most of it—the police officers had already taken from me—I don't remember whether I was allowed to hand my money to my wife. The drive with a strong police officer on either side through the lovely countryside would have been a joy but the thoughts about the future were too dark. After about an hour we reached a big barracks—Budbrook Barracks near Warminster it turned out later—drove through the large main

gate. . . . I was led into the main guard room and handed over to the sergeant on duty. I had to surrender my pocket knife, razor, and all my notes and reading matter. I was specially sorry to part with my notes of H. G. Wood's lectures on St. Mark's Gospel—I never saw them again. A heavy iron-clad door in the back wall was opened and I had to go into the cell, where I found 8 fellow refugees who greeted me with mixed feelings, for the cell was actually meant for 4–5 persons. . . . My fellow internees were two engineers from the B.S.A., one with his boy of 16, a young missionary, and 4 youngish refugees who had worked on the land.

The Birmingham police had simply handed us over to the military authorities, since prison accommodation was full to overflowing in Birmingham, owing to the work of the Advisory Committee. And the military obviously were at a loss to understand what we were. The soldiers and the sergeant had never heard of refugees and listened with the keenest interest to our stories. We were kept *incommunicado*—no letters, no visitors, no newspapers. We were not prisoners of war, but were also not normal enemy aliens. So we were not given prison food, but received the soldiers' rations, and found the food almost too much, with an enormous breakfast, plenty of tea and white bread, lunch and supper. I never noticed any hostility on the part of the soldiers. They were delighted to consume what we could not eat, they saw to the washing of our shirts and no doubt made some profit on it, the sergeant was quite willing to buy fruit for us and to bring it wrapped in today's newspaper, so that we could follow the war news.

One night we noticed that something unusual was happening and climbing on to the window we could see some of the troops marching in, coming straight from Dunkerque without any equipment at all. Occasionally we went for a walk accompanied by a sergeant, over the large training fields inside the walls, and once or twice we were taken to the bathhouse and could have a hot shower. Most of our time during the day we spent inside the small stone paved yard of the prison, talking or playing darts.

After about ten days we were moved to Huyton Camp near Liverpool. This was an emergency camp mainly for transit. It consisted of a large number of small houses on an estate for working-class families. The builders had just finished their work and handed the estate over to the municipality, but there were no roads, no gardens, not a single piece of furniture. A high double

barbed-wire fence had been made round the estate with watch towers on all corners and search lights which lighted up the camp during the night. Between the two fences the guards marched up and down and called on the soldiers on the watch towers so that there was not a moment of real quiet in the night.

On entering the gate each internee was handed an empty sack and told to fill it with straw from an enormous stack; he was given also a blanket, a tin, a spoon and a fork; then each group of new arrivals was led to houses and these were filled to capacity. . . . The houses had running water, but not a single piece of furniture. There was no possibility of using the kitchen. Instead the soldiers had constructed primitive field kitchens in the open, using bricks which the builder had left on the site. . . . We never had anything except porridge and a kind of soup. We received rations of very good white bread, margarine and jam.

Very soon hygienic conditions were beyond belief. The W.C.s were blocked since no toilet or any other paper was provided; nothing could be washed; there was no provision for baths; the sick, the invalid, had to live among the rest; there was no doctor and no sick bay. There was nothing to do all day long. It was a blessing that the weather was dry and warm. New groups arrived incessantly day and night.

I was seriously worried about my old mother whom I had left in my house in Oxford with my brother and his wife. If these were interned—I did not know if that had already happened—she would be in serious difficulties. I was fortunate in finding a fellow internee who gave me a piece of paper and an envelope. I wrote instructions to my bank in London to send my mother a sum of £3 weekly and went in search of the English camp commander. I believe I managed to speak to him or to one of his assistants. I explained that my mother might be left penniless unless my letter reached my bank. He read my letter, kept it and sent me away. Later I found that he had posted it, and that my mother had received her weekly allowance regularly throughout the period of my internment.

After a few days I heard a rumour that a group of internees from Oxford had come to the camp. I set out at once to find this group and after many hours of weary inquiries found the group and among them my brother. How I managed to get him into my house I don't know, but from that moment we kept together to the day of my release. From him I learned the latest news.

A few days later again a rumour spread that two categories of internees could volunteer for transport to other camps: (1) those who knew that their wives had been interned and sent to the Isle of Man could volunteer for camps on the Isle of Man; (2) orthodox Jews could volunteer to go to a camp near London where their fellow religionists had undertaken to provide them with their special food at their own expense. Those who wanted to go were ordered to assemble very early the next morning on the parade ground. This was rather ironic. We had received no letters, no newspapers since internment—now nearly three weeks in the case of my group. How were we to know if our wives had been interned? But I said to my brother that if we did not know, it was clear that the commander did not know either, and that conditions could not be worse on the Isle of Man than they were in Huyton. So we decided to volunteer for the Isle of Man.

Next morning there were two large groups assembled on the parade ground: volunteers for the Isle of Man who claimed to know that their wives were already on the Isle of Man (among them were youths of 16, 17, and 18 years of age) and the orthodox Jews. . . . When we embarked on the steamer for the Isle of Man we found to our great surprise that the orthodox Jews were already on board ship. Whether this was a prearranged change of plans or by mistake, I was unable to find out.

It was a wonderful day for a crossing, fine and warm, the sea a clear blue and not a cloud in the sky. But we had been given no provisions for the day and had not even had breakfast before leaving the camp. So the officer in charge of the party ordered a few big boxes in the holds to be opened, designed for grocers in Douglas. He found large quantities of tinned sardines, tomato juice, cheese and margarine and bottled beer, and with the bread on the ship we had magnificent meals and altogether a really enjoyable day.

From the quay in Douglas (Isle of Man) we marched to Mooragh camp through streets which had been cleared for us by the police, lined by sullen crowds. Mooragh camp consisted of a row of boarding houses and hotels along the seashore. The owners had been told to leave their houses, they had taken their personal effects with them and had left behind furniture and bedding (but no linen), china, glass, cutlery and kitchen utensils. The whole group of houses had been surrounded by a double barbed-wire fence, even

along the beach. Houses for the camp commandant, the military administration, and stores were outside the barbed wire just by the side of the big gate, but a large open space was, fortunately, inside the main wire fence for games or walks, or for just lying in the sun looking out over the sea and thinking like Ulysses: 'If only I could see once again the smoke rising from the chimney of my home.'

The Premier Private Hotel was a small house, which normally housed twenty-five guests. Now about sixty internees were packed into it. I was fortunate in the rush on entering the house, for I found my way up to the best large front bedroom on the first floor and managed to occupy a bed, without sheets of course. There was a second bed on the other inside wall, three more internees slept on straw palliasses on the floor. The two outside walls had large windows overlooking the sea. We found two chests of drawers, two small wardrobes, a table and two chairs in the room and felt that we were living in luxury.

The camp contained about 1,200 internees; they were a very mixed lot of all ages, all political shades and most skills and professions and many nationalities, the majority Germans and Austrians. It was run on the principle of self-administration, the camp commandant and his few officers and old soldiers being responsible for security and order to the War Office. We had to keep our house clean, to prepare and cook our own meals, wash up, &c. Very early in the morning a group from each house had to go to the stores to receive the rations, which were the normal rations for civilians and thus quite sufficient for calorific value but lacking in fresh vegetables and fruit.

The quality of the meals depended entirely on the skill of the cooks. We in the Premier Hotel were rather unfortunate in that we had too many commercial travellers, lawyers, engineers, but no professional cook, so we had very bad meals until we managed to swap one Egyptologist who was a clever entertainer and one lawyer against a cook from another hotel. Then the quality of our meals improved considerably.

There was no sick bay or hospital and no doctor at first, and the German and Austrian doctors among the refugees were not permitted to look after the sick and the invalids. After some time a G.P. from Douglas came to the camp twice weekly and examined those who could come to his emergency consulting room; but he

had no medicines and serious surgical cases who needed an operation had to be transported to a local hospital. Others just lay in bed or on their palliasses. Later still, a few rooms were turned into an emergency sick bay.

On the whole relations between officers and men and the refugees were friendly, since most officers tried to be as helpful as they could within their very limited powers. We were not allowed to receive newspapers, but the officers always 'forgot' their own papers in the office and never asked where these disappeared. So we knew what happened in the world, as far as newspapers could tell. But we still received no letters, were not allowed to send any letter to our families, and no visitors came to the camp. This separation from the outside world was a hardship, but since the Geneva convention relating to P.o.W. and civilian prisoners did not apply to us and we, naturally, did not wish to call for the protection of the Swiss diplomatic representative, since he represented the interests of the German Nazi government, we had no protection except through public opinion, Parliament, the Churches and the press. While we were kept *incommunicado* these were necessarily unable to do anything for us.

But one afternoon late in June or early in July I was suddenly ordered to come to the commandant's house to see a visitor. To my great surprise and greatest joy I found my Quaker friend William Hughes in the drawing-room of the commandant's house. During the 1914-18 war he had visited many camps for enemy aliens and reported on conditions to the War Office. For this purpose he had received a free passport, duly signed and sealed by the Secretary of State for War, which entitled him to visit all civilians camps and to ask to see individual prisoners who were under the care of the Society of Friends. The document—so it was rumoured—contained no date for its expiry. So William Hughes had taken it out from among his papers, had compiled a list of refugees who were on the lists of the Society of Friends and had gone with that list to the Isle of Man. The commandant had acknowledged the authority of this passport and when W. Hughes had asked to see me confirmed that I was a prisoner in the camp and ordered me to be brought to his house. . . .

I had told him how anxious I was about my wife's whereabouts and to make contact with my mother and he promised to write to her at once and to tell her that he had visited me. I also heard from

It was a very depressing and moving experience when the group left the camp under strong military escort for its long, dangerous journey to a far-away country. A little later a rumour reached the camp that a ship with deportees had been torpedoed and sunk in the Atlantic on its way to Australia with the loss of many lives. Had our friends been on this ship? We did not know.

Shortly afterwards we were ordered to attend a camp meeting. The Commandant would make an important announcement. He told us that arrangements had been made for a journey to visit the women's camps to see wives and mothers. Those who had wives or mothers in Port St. Mary of Port Erin would be brought there by railway in the morning and return the same day. Great excitement and joy. The little old railway took quite a long time to cover the few miles across the Isle of Man and in the middle stopped for a long halt. Then we were informed by our officers that the purpose of the visit was to decide with our wives if we would volunteer to go to Australia, for the Government had decided to give this opportunity now to married men as well. We would have to sign declarations in which we stated that we had voluntarily accepted the offer to go to Australia. We were told that, once in Australia, we would be released and would be free to start a new life with permission to remain in Australia after the end of the war. There was again a quota of volunteers for the camp, which would have to be filled. We were deeply depressed and what had started with much joyful expectation had now been turned to gloom. We had been told on arrival in the women's camp to march, in military fashion, in closed formation to a ballroom of a big hotel where we would meet our wives. But these had, of course, all turned up at the station and lined the pavements of the road to the hotel. In no time was the closed formation broken and we had our wives in our arms and all the shouting of the women police officers was quite in vain. We were allowed half an hour with our wives to make up our minds whether to volunteer for transportation to Australia. My wife and I decided to decline the offer.

The fact that I had been re-classified as category 'B' had unfortunate effects. When I returned home I was rather ill and spent a great deal of the autumn and winter in bed. From time to time the Oxford police would make inquiries whether my health had now sufficiently improved for me to be re-interned. Since I was a refugee of the 'B' class I had to be kept interned when my health was strong

enough to stand internment. This situation was very harassing. In September my wife returned home—released on grounds of health. Throughout the winter I fought for my re-classification as 'C' and, in the end, I succeeded.

2. A Sociologist on the Way to Canada

July 3rd. . . . What we suspected the other day and what I hinted at in my last letter . . . has now happened with extraordinary suddenness. A week ago the Adjutant of our Douglas Camp called all people between twenty and thirty and unmarried together and told us that we should be sent somewhere. Then there was a week's guessing with the odds on Canada since we had read in papers about the proposal of the Canadian Government to accept interned refugees. The day before yesterday it transpired that we would leave the following day. We were still without money, which have not been paid out (our money that was impounded at Bury St. Edmunds seems to be completely lost), without the documents that had been impounded, many without shoes, lots of people for various reasons very unwilling to go. I argued with the Commander for fifteen minutes whether engaged people could be counted as married. I did not want to go. . . . But the Commander had his War Office orders and could do nothing. I therefore had to resign myself to the course of events and spent the last two days on the Isle of Man in frantic discussions in the Camp Committee (as Camp 'Secretary'), answering thousands of questions, denying the wildest rumours, and negotiating again and again with the officers. In the end, we heard yesterday morning that we would leave the same afternoon. . . .

Yesterday after lunch 360 of us left the old camp. After four hours of luggage examination (during which our group was suddenly joined by sixteen older—and mostly married—people who had half an hour before been told that they, too, were being deported to Canada as 'trouble-makers'—Colonel Kahle and Professor Wilde among them!) and that waiting about to which one gradually gets accustomed, we had to carry our luggage to the quay and were loaded on board a small but fast ship at 9 p.m. Sleeping criss-cross in a small space below deck we got to Liverpool this morning. By then we still had not been told officially where we were being sent. Some of us still suspected a return to Huyton, &c. In any case, a remark of the old Commander's had led me to believe

that we would have at least a week at Liverpool within which to write, &c. As it happened, we were shoved from the small ship into a shed in which 1,000 people stood packed waiting for about three hours. (Two large groups from Onchan and Huyton camps had joined the Douglas group.) Two windows enabled a few of us to look across the water, where they soon discovered a large passenger liner being tugged to the quay. It became clear beyond doubt that this meant an immediate shipment to Canada. But it was too uncomfortable in the shed to think much about the implications. I had known it all along since the first preparations. But it was no good worrying all the time. After hours we were led on the ship in single file. We had made plans for trying to get a nice outside cabin in a good part of the ship, on a high deck, &c. Our hopes sank when we were taken right down into the bowels of the ship.

She is a troop-carrier with large rooms (mess-decks) with low ceilings. One thousand internees were crammed together in three such rooms alongside each other. At first conditions were indescribable. People waited all day in these rooms in a frightful atmosphere. There were ventilators, but the portholes had to remain closed. There were twice as many people as the rooms should hold. The officers (so we were told) had also come to Liverpool the same morning; they were completely helpless and refused to see us. The internees were from three previous camps, and it was almost impossible to establish any organization. . . . The worst thing was that we had not been given anything to eat for almost twenty-eight hours. In the evening hammocks were distributed and at 7 p.m. we were able to fetch food from the kitchen. The night was awful. People slept crowded in hammocks strung up under the ceiling like sardines. I tried to sleep at first on a narrow part of the open deck. After about two hours the water began to splash over the deck (we had left Liverpool about 8 p.m.) and I had to go down. Fortunately I found an empty hammock and slept there till 5.30 a.m.

July 4th. Yesterday was taken up by caring for the sea-sick. There was not much of a sea, but by 4 p.m. practically everyone was sick who had not managed to get on deck. . . . In the evening more than 100 on my deck were still sick and our evening meal was rather an improvised affair on a table as far from the worst cases as possible. During the evening meal I went round from table to table asking people to appoint 'table-elder' and then called the 'elders' together for a meeting. I explained that we must have some

internal organization and some representatives to negotiate with the officers. I was appointed chief for our deck. . . . I slept beautifully that night in a hammock precariously slung in a thicket of other hammocks.

July 5th. . . . After breakfast, which took place in a terrible muddle between the first and second shift of twenty at each table, we organized a large cleaning campaign with L. and a number of other people. . . . Working from 10 a.m. till 2 p.m. we got the place fairly clean and more or less tidy. . . . One grand Viennese spent an hour playing the accordion and singing with himself, all the time fighting against sea-sickness. After an hour's sleep I went up on the top deck for the first time. We are now allowed to go up there in double shift for two hours each. One lies about reading or playing cards and enjoying the fresh air. . . . At 6 p.m. we have our second and last meal per day. The food is, on the whole, good and very plentiful (but see below)—better than in any of our previous camps, except perhaps on the Isle of Man where our own cook had done wonders with mediocre material. In the evening I took part in the worst scenes that happen here—washing up on the next deck above. A frightful scramble of 30–40 people around a table with huge bowls of hot water, trying to steal each other's cutlery and plates (most tables haven't got enough), all of it in semi-darkness and in a state of indescribable filth and din. . . .

July 6th. Things have been much better today. Breakfast worked fairly smoothly after a lengthy wrangle with the second shift who wanted to eat first. . . .

The worst thing now is the terrible overcrowding of the place. . . . There is so little space for quiet talk or occupation that one hardly gets to know other people. The obstructionists are relatively few; but they give enough trouble. On the whole, people are good and willing to co-operate, considering the fact that they have been interned for eight weeks and are now being shoved across the Atlantic like cattle. Our group has, in the main, been selected from among the unmarried between twenty and thirty. These young people had mostly come to England only a few months or years ago and are losing little. They take their fate stoically and with as much humour as they can muster. There are some older people who are leaving their wives and children, their property and position in England. They are pretty miserable and a few have broken down and can hardly be comforted. . . .

July 7th. . . . The sea was beautifully calm. It had the result that people recovered from their sea-sickness and the food rations which had been divided among the few good sailors decreased appreciably. On the other hand, it became possible to keep the place relatively clean. Nothing outstanding happened except a rather unpleasant interlude with the military. In the morning when one shift of 300-odd people was taken on deck and they were kept in one corner of the deck to wait until the previous shift had gone downstairs, a sergeant, while trying to push people back, suddenly pulled out a long large rubber truncheon and started beating ten, fifteen people right on the head as hard as he could. He had simply lost his head and temper. It was a disgusting performance in front of the eyes of the (German) prisoners of war (there were 450 of them on board, kept apart from the internees) who stood on the other side of the partition and no doubt enjoyed this re-enactment of concentration camp scenes. . . . There was much subdued excitement afterwards below deck until an announcement from the Command was made to the effect that the sergeant would be punished.

July 8th. In the afternoon again discussions with the other deck chiefs on the food question. Further endless difficulties with shouting groups clamouring for food. Thank God, it is only another four or five days! Rumour has it that we shall arrive on Saturday. Where, we don't know, maybe Halifax or Quebec or God knows where. . . . If only we had some news. It's more than a fortnight now since I last heard any news about the situation in England. . . .

July 9th. . . . I played a lot of bridge and a game or two of chess. Bridge now for very high stakes—half a bar of chocolate or two cigarettes. Both come from sources which I, as an 'official', do not know about. We have now passed through thick fog for almost 24 hours. . . . Yesterday afternoon the Committee of Deck-fathers had a longish meeting with the captain-interpreter in charge of us. We tried to drive home for the nth time since our internment that we are refugees from Nazi oppression—not Nazis; and that we insist on our status as 'temporarily interned refugees'. . . . There is, of course, some thrill and sense of adventure in this sudden departure to a wholly new country and continent. And if it weren't for the enforced separation from you, the worry about your safety, and my dislike of leaving England I might be able to abandon myself pretty fully to this sense of excitement. . . .

July 10th. This morning I heard in a fairly authentic form a

rumour of which I heard the first traces some days ago, namely that a previous ship with internees and prisoners of war which left England Thursday before last (*Arandora Star*) was torpedoed off the coast of Ireland and sunk with the loss of 3,000 men—only 700-odd being saved. . . . As far as we are personally concerned, the rumour affects us chiefly inasmuch as you may hear about the disaster without knowing whether we were on the ship or not. . . .

July 11th. On our right, far away, we saw the first piece of America, the south coast of Newfoundland, surprisingly high hills wrapped up in clouds. Just before going below deck we also saw two ships—a grand experience after a long voyage without any sign of life outside the ship.

July 12th. Today it is two months since our internment. . . . Sometimes every day I have a period of utter misery. . . . We are now hoping that after our landing tomorrow night or on Sunday we shall very soon be able to write or even wire. . . . On Friday evening the Committee on the ship were told that we would land the following morning. . . .

July 13th. . . . Before breakfast we had reached the St. Lawrence River and went upstream. I was very busy trying to collect the scattered handkerchiefs, gas masks, &c., in a hastily improvised Lost Property Office and at the same time taking the groups up on to the top decks for roll-call. By 10 a.m. everyone had been taken up on to the front top deck with all their luggage. . . . The weather was wonderful, and we enjoyed one of the most beautiful sceneries I have ever seen. At first, people were so wrapt in the view that they hardly noticed how the time passed as they were crowded together on the front deck, unable to get down again and waiting for our arrival. . . . We docked at 1.30 p.m. By then people had waited for three hours and a half on the deck in the sun. The Colonel who was in command of the transport was getting more and more nervous, being unable to cope with the disembarkation proceedings; he raged about, shouting at everyone. One of our internees, a little Jewish boy, was kicked by him and beaten with his stick, accompanied by the words: 'Get back, you lousy lot.' . . .

After docking at the quay nothing happened for hours. The prisoners of war were disembarked first. In the meantime we waited and waited for hours, getting hungrier and some getting desperate as they were again not allowed to go to the lavatory. . . . At 7.30 p.m. at last we were taken off the ship. Our heavy luggage had previously

been collected and taken off the ship by porters. We marched down the gangway in single file and made very consciously our first step on American soil. We were taken to buses in groups of twenty and after every piece of luggage down to the last bread carrier and violin had been torn out of people's hands and added to the luggage we were taken in buses through Quebec. . . .

It was fascinating to drive through traffic and ordinary people going about their business, and advertisements, after weeks of relative isolation. By about 8 p.m. we once again reached barbed wire. We drove into the compound and were unloaded in the sight of a large number of well-constructed and nicely spaced-out wooden huts. Again in groups of twenty we were taken to one of the huts with a rumour of food in the air. But nothing materialized. We waited till about midnight, when we were taken in groups into another hut. There we had to undress (for the second time; I forgot to mention a previous undress parade for medical examination immediately after our arrival) and one by one had every item of our belongings taken away from us by sergeants and privates. Most of the things were put into green bags with our names on them and lists were made with the articles. But we soon found that the soldiers were taking cigarettes and later also watches, fountain pens, money, &c., without putting them down. We were all terribly weary (the last group was not searched until 5 a.m.) and did not offer any resistance. We were promised that everything would be returned the following morning. After the examination we were taken into another hut and at 12.45 a.m. we got our first food since breakfast; a good slice of bread with a piece of bully beef and water. We were then shown to our sleeping huts and . . . I fell asleep at about 1.15 a.m.

July 14th. We had been asked to look forward to breakfast next morning at 7 a.m. It was Sunday, and we heard the church bells of a Catholic town. Instead we found ourselves locked in our hut and were not let out till 11.30. . . . At 12 we got our second meal in almost thirty-six hours, a slice of bread, a rasher of bacon, and tea. . . . From one corner of the camp we had a magnificent view across the St. Lawrence River and the hills beyond. We soon found that in our hut there happened to be a group of some thirty people (out of a hundred) who were Nazis or at least on the side of Germany. . . . Before the meal, therefore, I was elected hut-father over the pro-Nazi vote (the latter supported by most of a group of Roman

Catholic priests). . . . In the afternoon we had a meeting of hut-fathers with Captain Milne, an old commercial clerk, who had come with us as Intelligence Officer, and a Canadian Lieutenant. . . . They rejected practically all our requests and demands for immediate communication with our relatives, for our luggage, our confiscated belongings, &c. I got very depressed and nearly lost control of my voice in a very bitter speech which I made. I am afraid it impressed my fellow internees more than the officers. The rest of the day was spent in protracted attempts to exchange the pro-Nazis and refugees of different huts so as to get rid of the former because it was too difficult to arrange individual preferences. (A month later the arrangement was successfully made.) In the evening we got our first warm meal for forty hours, some meat and potatoes. At 8.30 we were locked into our huts, still without our luggage, and went to bed in our day clothes.

July 15th. The following morning the food situation improved. Breakfast was fairly punctual. It consisted of bread, butter, bacon, honey, and tea. Bread was still short. Our people had organized the kitchen, which is well equipped, in the middle of a large eating-hut with nice clean tables. In the course of the morning began the procedure of returning to us our luggage and confiscated goods which was to occupy everyone in the camp for the next two days. When the green bags were opened it was soon found that the sergeants and privates had used the unrivalled opportunity of the night search to steal on a colossal scale. Money, watches, pens, cigarettes, lighters, everything of value had been appropriated by them. . . . By the evening it was discovered that money and articles to the value of altogether £1,200 were missing, not counting some 20,000 cigarettes. At the same time our luggage was put up in a long row in the street outside the barbed wire for examination and collection. Here the robbery started again. The soldiers stole several typewriters in front of the eyes of their owners; later they 'confiscated' all sorts of useful objects from suitcases. Most of these disappeared and have not been seen again. In the late afternoon, after scenes of indescribable confusion, Captain M. who had been unable to cope with the situation, was suddenly replaced by a Scottish Intelligence Officer who had just come over from England. He took matters in hand and ordered all remaining luggage to be returned to us without further examination. I was lucky in getting back all my belongings including my fountain pen and even my

ring. . . . The whole search had been illegal. It should have been carried out by officers, not N.C.O.s and privates. In any case they had no right to impound any except a few definite articles. . . . The Commandant and the other officers soon expressed their regret to our committee. (Later a military court of inquiry was set up: the results of the inquiry are unknown to me.) Since the remaining money has been impounded and there is no credit system and canteen as yet the whole camp is practically without tobacco, a desperate state of affairs (which continued for five weeks).

July 16th. . . . The food has improved greatly. We have got a most efficient cook. The quality of the raw materials is excellent, plenty of meat, good vegetables. We now get three meals a day and for the first time since our internment we are really being well and adequately fed.

July 17th. . . . The most important events were that during the night an internee who had the day before tried to attack another one in a hut and had been put into the camp hospital as mentally disturbed apparently tried to break out of the hospital and was, according to the most reliable accounts . . . shot by a passing sergeant of the guard through the thin wood of the hospital wall. . . . The other big event of the day was the issue of letter paper. We are again permitted only two letters a week. The issue raised a new outcry because the letters and envelopes bore the inscription 'prisoners of war mail'. . . . In the end most of the refugees refused to use the letters until the following morning a runner announced that the officers had given permission to cross out P.o.W. and substitute 'civilian internee'. (These letters were written for two weeks; after a fortnight they were returned from Ottawa. For the next four weeks the internees wrote no letters at all, although they had still not been able to tell their relatives of their arrival in Canada. They confined themselves to the writing of a uniformly worded postcard announcing the bare fact of their arrival.)

3. An Anatomist in Canada

On July 3rd, 1940, boys of 16 to 20 and single men of 30 to 40 interned at the Central Promenade Camp, Douglas (Isle of Man) were ordered to assemble with their luggage for an overseas transport. We were searched, our money impounded. Most of us were given a receipt for impounded documents which had been taken

earlier on. The night was spent in a dance hall. Next morning we left in a small boat for Glasgow. All interned people of the age groups quoted above had to leave except for those people who had their fathers interned in the same camp.

In Glasgow we were transferred to the Polish liner *Sobieski*. There it was found that 200 of us could not be taken on board as the ship was overcrowded. I myself volunteered at first to stay behind. But it became obvious immediately that staying behind meant only the loss of luggage, the separation from friends, and deportation at another date. I managed to get on board *Sobieski*. The ship left in convoy the next morning. Owing to the overcrowding of the boat, cabins for four people were shared by eight internees. Most of us, however, had to sleep on tables or on the floor of dining-rooms or bars. On July 12th the ship called at St. John, Newfoundland, and on the 15th we reached Quebec. On board ship we were searched again and all our luggage was taken from us. Only after two days were we allowed to retrieve at least the necessary toilet articles. Polish stewards were particularly unfriendly. Thus, for instance, they prepared tea with salt water on the days following our call at St. Johns. The excuse given was the shortage of drinking water. We found as usual that British soldiers guarding us were very friendly and full of understanding for our position.

On reaching Quebec we were searched again and there manicure articles (like nail-scissors, files), toilet articles (like looking-glasses), and money were confiscated. We left then by train for Camp T at Trois Rivières, where we stayed from the 15th July to the 12th August. When we arrived we found Nazi prisoners—mainly members of the mercantile marine—in possession of the prepared accommodation. Rather than share quarters with them we insisted on being separated and spent a few days in a bare hall, into which our beds had been brought. For the time of our joint stay in this camp we were separated from the Nazis by a barbed-wire fence. They left after a very short period and we took over the prepared accommodation. This consisted of a two-storied big hall and a recreation ground. The ground floor was used as sleeping quarters. There were also showers, wash-rooms, and sanitary arrangements. All of that equipment was excellent as also were beds, mattresses, and pillows. The upper floor was used as kitchen and dining-room. These again were well appointed. Food was very ample and of very good quality.

The gravest drawbacks of this camp were the lack of privacy (720 internees were using the same rooms all the time), the absence of newspapers (later remedied), and mainly the unfriendliness of the Commandant. For the first few days an English officer (Capt. Kemp) gave us verbally a short news summary on his own responsibility. After he left we were entirely without news till the visit of the General Officer Commanding Internment Operations. He ordered our Commandant to let us have newspapers, whereupon this officer at first offered us newspapers three weeks old. The strict Commandant of Camp T forbade all communication (even by letters) with societies interested in aiding refugees. Our complaint about the confiscation of various articles and money at Quebec was answered by the Commandant's offer to court-martial any soldier we could indicate as guilty, knowing full well that our guard was drawn from a different regiment and that we were utterly unable to trace anyone concerned.

On August 12th we left by train for Camp B in New Brunswick. This camp was by no means ready for us. We were told we had been expected in another month's time. Thus the huts were still being built when we came and the water supply was very unsatisfactory. During the eight days I stayed at the camp, conditions improved, mainly due to the care and friendly disposition of the officers administering this camp. Here we were given an opportunity to earn some money (20 cents a day) by forestry work. Working parties were taken outside the camp to shift logs, &c. The officers promised to allow communication with the outside world and especially with aid societies. Actually within the first days of our arrival a representative of the Jewish community in Fredericton came to see us.

The internees at Camp B number about 700. Of these at least 95 per cent. are genuine refugees from Nazi oppression. More than 50 per cent. are schoolboys, undergraduates, or trainees under the age of twenty. Of the older people the majority are transmigrants waiting mainly for their U.S.A. visas. There are, however, some scientists, research workers, engineers, and doctors with long residence and jobs in this country. There are a number of Roman Catholics, priests, and monks, and furthermore a group of refugees from Holland. All these groups are classed as prisoners of war by the Canadian authorities. Letters are marked 'Prisoner of War Mail'. Internees, of course, object to this classification which does not do

justice to their real status. Furthermore, they are afraid of the consequences of this status at the end of the war. Rather than use the letters marked 'P.o.W. Mail', internees in Camp L abstained from writing. The absurd position obtains that internees classified as 'refugees from Nazi oppression' by the British tribunals now appear as prisoners of war of Enemy Nationality, i.e. as Nazis according to Canadian law.

Money impounded at the time of our internment has so far not been forwarded. Actually money taken from me on May 12th reached me after my release only, namely on September 23rd. The shortage of money caused some inconvenience as internees were unable to buy tobacco and cigarettes. Far more serious was the inability of internees to replace broken eyeglasses, since these were not given free of charge.

From the time of leaving Douglas to August 21st—the day I left the camp—some 700 internees received altogether about a dozen letters and about as many cables. I have, however, reason to believe that matters have improved meanwhile. Only a very few parcels addressed to internees were forwarded from the Isle of Man to Canada. . . .

. . . In all camps school and university activities play a prominent part. There are various classes both for schoolboys and for undergraduates and there are also popular lectures. Concerts and variety shows are arranged once a week. There are religious services for the Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Jewish communities. Education activities suffer somewhat from the lack of textbooks. But officers in Camp B showed a keen interest in these activities and promised to help with books.

The demands of refugees interned in Canadian Camps are as follows:

1. That their status as 'refugees from Nazi oppression' be officially recognized.
2. That their cases be reviewed individually as regards release from internment.
3. That if no shipping arrangements for the retransport to the United Kingdom be available, they be permitted to stay in Canada for the duration of the war and be permitted to continue with their studies or research (schoolboys, undergraduates, and research workers); that skilled people be usefully employed and thus help in the war effort.

4. That transmigrants be allowed to immigrate into the various American countries directly from Canada and that they be allowed facilities to communicate with various consulates.

For (3) a guarantee from the British Government is necessary that the people concerned will be allowed to return to the United Kingdom at the end of the war. At the moment the Canadian Government considers interned refugees as illegal immigrants and thus refuses, for instance, to allow a boy of sixteen, Ulrich Wassermann (son of a famous Austrian author), to join his mother, a naturalized Canadian and lecturer at one of the Canadian universities.

For (4) the earliest forwarding of impounded documents such as passports is essential. In one case, for instance, Dr. Johannes Holtfreter, one of the refugees, had the offer of an associate professorship at the University of California. Although officers in charge of Huyton Camp (May 23rd to June 14th) promised to forward the passport to the American Consulate in London, this document was found in Douglas on July 3rd and may still be with the other impounded documents in this country. The same applies to affidavits which have not been forwarded either.

The following measures are deemed necessary:

A. That the British Government undertake:

1. To allow refugees, released from internment in Canada for the duration of the war, to return to the United Kingdom at the end of the war.
2. To allow the transfer of funds to Canada necessary for the maintenance of released refugees (schoolboys, undergraduates, research workers, &c.).

B. That the Canadian Government undertake:

1. To grant a visitor's visa for the duration of the war to internees eligible for release from internment.
2. To grant labour permits to those skilled refugees who can be usefully employed.

5. A New World and Old Problems.

1945-58

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE of S.P.S.L. met for the first time after World War II on October 17th, 1945, in the rooms of the Royal Society at Burlington House, the rooms where we had begun twelve and a half years before. The Minutes of this meeting illustrate all the main subjects that were to occupy us for the next twelve and a half years to the end of the story told in this volume, in the new world which victory had brought to us.

There was the problem of intolerance continuing though Hitler was dead; the problem of whether those who had found refuge in Britain from Hitler and his like should return to their old countries or become by naturalization citizens of a new country; the problem of fitting our service to the infinite variety of human needs; the personal problem of change in our own membership and organization, as all of us grew older or changed our surroundings; the domestic problem of where to do our work, whatever it might be; the problem of our policy for the future.

As a preliminary to discussing these problems in turn, a general picture of displaced scholars and their distribution when war ended is given. The figures below come from a report presented to the Executive Committee at its first post-war meeting.

Of the 2,541 displaced scholars on our register then, 624 were known to be in the United States; 612 in Britain; 80 in Central and South America, apart from Mexico to which nearly all the Spanish exiles had found their way; 74 in British Dominions; 66 in Palestine; 62 in the rest of the Middle East, with smaller numbers in many European countries like Switzerland, Scandinavia, Belgium, Holland, and so on. These local figures are far from adding up to the total on our register. They are of interest chiefly as showing the widespread migration of learned men resulting from persecution.

Of 612 displaced scholars known to be in Britain, 243 were at work in universities and parallel institutions (including research posts in hospitals); 170 in industry, commerce, and private medical or legal practice (including general practitioners in hospitals); 46 in

government posts (British or Allied); 23 in the army; 17 in schools, evening schools, and technical colleges; 14 in the B.B.C.; 38 were unemployed and 31 had not been traced.

The number of 624 displaced scholars known to us to have been in the United States in 1945 is roughly double both of the number aided by the American Emergency Committee (335),¹ and of the number aided by the Rockefeller Foundation (303)² of whom a proportion were still in Europe. Since the American Committee was helped largely by the Rockefeller Foundation, these two figures of 335 and 303 contain many of the same individuals. Probably well over half the displaced scholars who had found refuge in the U.S.A. by 1945 went there by the help of S.P.S.L., or other agencies like the *Notgemeinschaft*, or by their own efforts or those of friends.

As soon as we started work again in conditions of peace, we were forced to realize that, though Hitler was dead, intolerance went on. At our first meeting in the new world, we felt bound to decide that Czech scholars and Polish scholars who found themselves unable to recover academic employment in their own countries were eligible for grants from us. At our next meeting, three months later, we put it on record that 'Jewish and other anti-fascist scholars first ejected by the Nazis and Henlein, were now refused academic rehabilitation by the Czechs'. In our Fifth Report, published in 1946, we gave the number of Poles registered with us and still in Britain at 68; we hoped for agreed repatriation of most of them, and particularly of the 25 members of the Polish School of Medicine which had enjoyed throughout the war the hospitality of the University of Edinburgh.

There followed recurrent dismissals of academics in other countries, from China to Portugal. At the end of 1946 we were told of dismissal on political grounds of 17 Greek and 4 Portuguese professors. At the end of 1947 Miss Margery Fry bespoke our sympathy for Chinese scholars belonging to a political organization known as the Democratic League which had been outlawed by the Chinese Government. A year later at the end of 1948 we were asked to consider the case of non-Communist scientists in Hungary. Our Chairman agreed that those of whom particulars had reached him would be easy to place here—if they could reach this country. But that was

¹ *The Rescue of Science and Learning*, by Stephen Duggan and Betty Drury, pp. 194–5. ² Annual Report of Rockefeller Foundation for 1945.

the crux of the problem. We did manage to get one or two Hungarians on to our grant list here, and they went almost at once to academic jobs. We could not rescue Hungarian scholars under Communism on the scale of our former rescue of German and Austrian scholars from Hitler.

Freedom of learning and teaching is non-existent in many parts of the world today. It is arguable that some scholars and scientists depart from the principle laid down in the Huxley Lecture of 1933,¹ and that if they wish to be trusted with academic posts they should not meddle with politics. But even if such scholars are not allowed to keep their posts and teach the young, they should not be assassinated.

Applications for naturalization of some of the academic refugees had begun before the war, in the case of persons who had been long enough in Britain to make such applications possible. After the war, from June 1945 onwards, we co-operated continuously with the Home Office, both in submitting further applications on behalf of scholars registered with us and in reporting on other applications referred to us by them for advice.

Naturally we took up at once also the alternative opened to our German and Austrian refugees at least by the result of the war—that of returning to their own countries. This was open to them in principle; the German universities had affirmed that men dismissed by the Nazis had a right to reinstatement in their former post or an equivalent one, or to emeritus status if they could no longer teach.² We set out to trace as many as possible of the scholars who had failed to leave their countries. By the beginning of 1946 we supplied to the appointing bodies of German and Austrian universities a list of the names, qualifications, and whereabouts (so far as was known) of all the scholars who had been displaced from them and were still alive.

Actually most of the academic refugees in Britain preferred to stay there. By the end of 1946 we were told that the number of scholars wishing to return from Britain to Germany or Austria was exceedingly small; the actual numbers were given as 4 for Germany and 7 for Austria.³ By contrast, naturalization proceeded apace. By

¹ See Chapter 1 above, p. 23.

² First Report of S.P.S.L., p. 7.

³ Report of Allocation Committee, November 27, 1946.

the end of 1947, of 492 scholars still resident in the British Isles, 296 had been naturalized already in Britain and a few in Eire; most of the rest had applications for naturalization pending.¹ We assume that most of these applications were successful, but we have no record of this. Our job on naturalization was finished, when we had given any necessary facts or recommendations to the Home Office.

Choice between staying in Britain and return to Germany was affected at first by uncertainty as to pension rights. It was not certain, for some time, that pensions in respect of former work in West Germany would be paid to university teachers who did not return to it. In due course the Government of West Germany restored pensions earned by former university work there to those who had been displaced and had settled in other countries.² There still remained till recently, at least for those settled in Britain, a further question as to how these pensions, paid in marks, could be spent. In the last year covered by this history—1958—what looks like a happy answer to this question has been found.

Under British Exchange Control money received in foreign currencies by persons domiciled here must in general be converted into sterling and cannot be used abroad. This applies to marks, including marks now coming to former German teachers settled in Britain in respect of service in Germany. They could not, for instance, without permission use such marks for helping to support relatives still in Germany, or for visiting Germany themselves for any purpose. And, till recently, permission for such purposes was only exceptionally given. Now, in August 1958, the British Exchange Control Authorities have agreed to consider sympathetically applications by former German teachers to use marks for such purposes as those named above. It was a great pleasure to me, after hearing the case for some such concession put to me by three distinguished academics from Germany now settled in Oxford as British citizens, to put this case to the Permanent Secretary of the British Treasury, and in due course to learn that this concession would be made. There are not as many relatives or dependants of refugee scholars as there should be left alive by Hitler in Germany. But there are some.

Naturalization produced at first an unexpected threat to our

¹ Executive Council, November 13, 1947.

² Restoration of pension rights in respect of public service, including university service, was the subject of three laws in West Germany passed in 1951, 1952, and 1953.

income. We had received since 1940 a payment from the Central Committee for Refugees of a proportion of our grants to any German and Austrian refugees. The Committee told us in 1947 that this payment ceased on naturalization; we could appeal against this but the appeal was not likely to prove successful. Unexpectedly our appeal did succeed—another example of the sympathetic treatment which we had learned to expect from the Central Committee under Sir Herbert Emerson.

In view of the advanced age of most of our grantees in 1946, we thought it reasonable to look for some endowment concerned with pensions to provide them. Our Secretary discovered in the Report of the Carnegie Corporation for 1945-6 a reference to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. This Foundation, created by Mr. Carnegie 'primarily for the purpose of paying pensions to retired college professors', was charged also 'to do and perform all things necessary to encourage, uphold and dignify the profession of the teacher and the cause of higher education'.

It seemed to our Executive Committee just the Foundation that they were looking for in spring of 1947. It seemed to them also that their President was just the person to write to the Carnegie Corporation and put their case. I wrote at once. But I received quickly the reply that the pension list of the Foundation had been closed officially in 1931 and that very few names had been added after 1917. 'The pension list could not be re-opened for foreign scholars if American scholars could not be considered for it.' Our Executive Committee could only receive this with regret. To this day I find it a little difficult to understand why the Carnegie Foundation was still being mentioned by the Carnegie Corporation in 1947, when its primary purpose had been abandoned practically thirty years before.

But providing pensions for displaced scholars has not been our main task hitherto, and it is not that now. Our task has always been one of fitting our help to the infinite variety of human needs, of keeping brains as well as bodies alive.

This point has been illustrated by examples in earlier chapters. It stands out even more clearly, if possible, for the troubled world which men have made for themselves by two world wars. To show this I need do no more than record here a few grants made by us in 1948 and 1953.

The twenty-four grants or loans recorded as made or cancelled in the year to September 30, 1948, relate to people with the following countries of origin: Germany 11, Austria 8, Italy 3, Czechoslovakia 1, Russia 1. In age, these people are divided almost equally between those over 70 and those well under 50; for a few, age does not enter, as they are dead. In subjects, Arts (including Law and the Social Sciences) outnumber Science by at least three to one.

The nature of the help given or action taken is bewilderingly various.

We helped an historian while waiting to become Lecturer for Russian Studies in the University of Cambridge, and an entomologist to travel with his family from a displaced persons' camp in Austria to an appointment in the British Museum. We kept an endocrinologist going till he was taken on by the British Empire Cancer Campaign. To a German philosopher we supplemented the income he earned by teaching in a Cambridge college.

We gave a number of grants designed to keep a scholar busy and happy on research proposed by him, till he found regular employment. Among the subjects of research thus made possible were: The German Public Mind in the Age of Imperialism, Tapestries in the Glasgow Museum, Illuminated Manuscripts in the British Museum, books on Faraday and on the Alphabet. We helped also, neither for the first nor the last time, towards completion of a manuscript for the Clarendon Press.

Among smaller grants, we gave an Austrian archaeologist £25, so that he could spend a month in the British Museum while on unpaid leave from work in a factory; we gave repatriation grants to a philologist (£37. 15s.) and to a musicologist (£50), to help with fares and luggage on return to Germany; by way of contrast, we paid the naturalization fee of £9 demanded of an elderly Italian lawyer and so helped him to stay here while completing research on Bismarck's foreign policy.

We helped a Czech mathematician to the tune of £15 for expenses in applying for posts in Britain, till he obtained at last a lectureship at the University of Tasmania.

We helped the widows of displaced professors who had died while on our books. We cancelled our claims to repayment of loans made to other professors when they died before completing repayment.

Our records of 1948 show life in a disordered world, with all its

unexpected inconveniences, being mitigated by thoughtfulness of friends.

Five years later the task of our Allocation Committee had become very small. Their minutes for February of 1953 record nine grants only. Five of the nine grantees were of ages ranging from sixty-four to eighty-one—a philosopher from Frankfurt, an orientalist from Halle, a lawyer from Breslau, a horticulturalist from Poland, and a pathologist from Vienna—all of extreme distinction. Two of them had needed help from the National Assistance Board but the S.P.S.L. was helping also; most of them were still at work, writing or lecturing when they had the chance, trying to keep their savings from disappearing too fast. Close to these five in age came a youngster of fifty-nine, an astronomer from Czechoslovakia who needed only a short grant for research at St. Andrews till he took up a post at the University of Manchester.

It is pleasant to record that the orientalist from Halle, the lawyer from Breslau, and the pathologist from Vienna all have pensions now in respect of past service in Germany or Austria, though the last of them, the oldest of them all, still spends part of his time in physiological research in Oxford, and the rest on research in his own Institute in Vienna; he is now 86. The astronomer from Czechoslovakia is at his post in Manchester, and the philosopher from Frankfurt still does coaching in Oxford. Only of the horticulturalist from Poland have we no current news.

To these six veterans refusing to be old, the February 1948 minutes added two recent refugees each about forty, each in himself evidence that intolerance is not ended. One was an astronomer from Poland, and the other a philosopher and ex-professor from Hungary. The astronomer from Poland is teaching science at a school in Lancashire, and the philosopher from Hungary is a Reader in Classics at the University of London.

Finally in 1948 came a delightful episode to lighten a world of horrors. The headmaster of Huntingdon Grammar School came along to S.P.S.L. with a gift of £20 in memory of a much-valued Jewish teacher of science on the school staff. The gift was used to help a Jewish refugee research student to pay his registration fees at the Imperial College of Science and Technology in London.

At our first post-war meeting in 1945, C. S. Gibson, a pillar of our work from the first day of all, resigned his position as Honorary

Secretary, though he remained on the Executive Committee till his death in March 1950. His place as Honorary Secretary was taken by Professor R. S. Hutton. At the same meeting we had notice that J. B. Skemp, our Secretary since November 1944, would leave us shortly for an academic post in Manchester. We appointed Miss I. J. Ursell, his Assistant Secretary, to succeed him as Secretary on his departure in 1946; she too left us on July 31, 1951.

With each succeeding meeting, or nearly so, we had to record a loss, through death or retirement, in our executive machine. In March 1946 came the death of Sir John Clapham, indefatigable Chairman of our Cambridge Allocation Committee in war and Chairman of our Executive Committee in its first post-war meeting. On unanimous demand he was succeeded as Chairman of the Executive by A. V. Hill, our Chairman still.

In October 1949 came the death of Professor Major Greenwood, who had modestly tried more than once not to be our Honorary Treasurer, urging that we needed a big business man or figure-head, but had in fact served us in this laborious post almost from the beginning. No one could have done the work better. We were equally fortunate in Dr. R. N. Salaman, as successor till his death in 1955. Thereafter Professor R. S. Hutton, who had been indefatigable in our work since the outbreak of World War II, particularly on the Cambridge Allocation Committee, added the Treasurership to all that he was doing already for us and for our cause.

In 1951 came a change of place as well. On the death of Sir John Clapham in 1946 we had decided, nevertheless, to stay in Cambridge, where we had gone on the outbreak of war and where he had been our central figure. It did not prove easy to find permanent housing there and when Miss Ursell left us five years later, we came back to London. We have been most hospitably housed since August 1951 by the Society for Visiting Scientists at 5 Old Burlington Street, and have recovered formally the service of Miss Simpson, who had gone to that Society in November 1944 and became now our Secretary as well. She had never really ceased to help us.

One other personal note should be entered here. On the death of our President, William Temple, in 1944, I had been chosen to succeed him. But almost immediately I went to live in the north—Northumberland, Durham, or Edinburgh—and I became practically an absentee from meetings of the Society for ten years. I did

anything that I was asked to do, like appealing—in vain—to the Carnegie Corporation to provide pensions for our grantees of pensionable age, and writing an introduction about the work of S.P.S.L. to a book by Professor Bentwich on *The Rescue and Achievement of Refugee Scholars*,¹ published by him in 1953. I went on soon after to urge that the work of our Society deserved a fuller record, based on study of all our documents. I said in 1954 that I would gladly write such a record myself, if I could have some help in collecting and studying the material. The Society and its officers gave me all the help I needed.

Though the Future Activities of the Society were on the agenda for our Executive Meeting of October 1946, we discussed then for the most part immediate practical issues, like taking up again the suspended business of naturalization or tracing displaced scholars who had not managed to leave their countries of origin but might still be alive.

At the end of 1946 two things seemed clear. First, that the number of refugee scholars wishing to return to Germany or Austria was very small, most of them being established elsewhere and either naturalized already or on the way to naturalization. Second, that most of those who would still need regular financial help in Britain were in effect pensioners.

Our policy conclusion in March 1947 was that we should aim at closing down in two years. Fortunately we said that this decision of March 1947, to close down, should be reviewed in the following March. As has been stated above, the Carnegie Foundation did not take over our pensioners, so they still had to rely on us. Far more important than this, by March 1948 the world looked different from the world of March 1947.

Miss Margery Fry had already bespoken our help for Chinese professors who were being victimized. Always ready to listen to her, we had set aside money for her purpose and we made inquiries in the Far East as to what could be done. These inquiries, it is true, led to the conclusion that we should probably do more harm than

¹ This book did not easily find a publisher in Britain and in the end was published by the firm of Nijhoff at The Hague. Later in 1956 Professor Bentwich published through the Cresset Press, London, with introduction by Viscount Samuel, a book entitled *They Found Refuge*, described as 'An account of British Jewry's work for victims of Nazi oppression'.

good to the Chinese professors by moving to their rescue now. But we had proof from a number of countries that defence of free learning was a continuing need.

Our Executive Committee decided in March 1948 'that the Society should remain in being to deal with continuing needs and possible future crises'. Before the end of that year Hungary came in to confirm the wisdom of that decision. This is the last decision we have taken till now, though the best method of continuing support of free learning is the subject of discussion.

As the post-war years ran on, the work coming to our Society changed. In 1946 and 1947 nearly all our regular grants were being made to distinguished men of considerable age. Ten years later, as our Chairman A. V. Hill told a special meeting of Officers on October 29, 1956, only one displaced scholar was being supported by us. Some of the former regular grantees had died. Others had received from the West German Government restitution of pensions for work in Germany.

The practical result, as our Chairman said, was that the Society's income exceeded its expenditure and its invested capital was increasing. For a society with our past this seemed shocking. Ought we to continue in our present form? The practical answer of the Officers in October 1956 was a decision to explore with the Royal Society and the British Academy the possibility of their taking over our funds (there would be more than £8,000 for each of them) and undertaking our responsibilities in use of the money, under a scheme to be approved by our subscribers.

Within a few days of the October meeting, a new storm burst in Hungary. Soviet-supported Communist persecution of all men of independent opinion broke out, was carried to the death, and has continued to this day. At their next meeting, which occurred in January 1958, the Executive Committee found themselves ratifying grants to five Hungarian scholars (in economics, agriculture, engineering, industrial hygiene).

The idea of handing over our money and our task to others went into the background. When a few months later, in April 1958, our Executive Committee discussed future policy again, we considered not so much going out of business as putting ourselves on a solid basis by incorporation.

In considering future policy for a body like S.P.S.L. two distinct questions arise, one of principle and one of method. Is there con-

tinuing need for what our Society set out to do? Is the Society, just as we have it today, the best way of meeting such a need?

It is not for me in writing this history of the past to answer the question of method for the future. One could probably get the service we have rendered in the past rendered again in future either by going on as in the past, or by incorporating ourselves, or by enlisting the active interest of such bodies as the Royal Society and the British Academy.

On the question of principle the answer is clear. With tyranny and intolerance established over so much of the world, can anyone who has known freedom doubt that the task which we set out to do twenty-five years ago, in defence of free learning, still needs to be done? It needs to be done more than ever.



6. Wandering Scholars

1. The Making of this Chapter

IN JUNE 1958 we sent to all scholars on the register of S.P.S.L. a letter telling them of the proposed history of the Society and the A.A.C. before it, during the past twenty-five years, and inviting their co-operation if they felt inclined to give it, by telling us something about themselves and their experience in those years. For this purpose the letter was accompanied by a form, described as Form A, for return to us with anything that the scholar chose to tell us.

The letter and Form A are both printed in Appendix 5 below. They were not sent only to scholars whom we had helped ourselves, but to all scholars of whom we had reason to believe that they had been displaced on racial or political grounds. Ultimately they were posted to 1,170 scholars altogether, in all parts of the world. We had not even a probable address for more than this number, and our experience has shown that, in a changing world, many addresses that we used were out of date or insufficient; a number of our letters came back to us as undeliverable. Some scholars addressed were no longer alive; though occasionally we got answers from a widow or a child that could be used, this was rare.

Up to the end of 1958 we have had 561 answers from scholars or on their behalf to our letter of June, nearly all on Form A but occasionally, as alternative to the form, a letter that is as interesting and important. I had signed personally all the circular letters that we sent out. I have looked personally at all the replies that have come in to us. No study that I have made in my life has ever seemed more worth while. The outstanding feature of these answers is the care which those who sent them to us took, in order to give full and accurate information on the questions put to them.

Dealing with the material thus provided falls naturally into two parts. There are the answers to the specific questions of fact in our form, running from its first to its seventh paragraph. There are the answers to paragraph VIII in the form, inviting any other information which the scholar thinks may be of interest to us and his judgement on what he experienced. The questions of fact are dealt with

in the next section of this chapter: The Scholars Travel. The answers under paragraph VIII are dealt with mainly in the third and fourth sections of the chapter: The Scholars Speak their Thanks, and The Scholars Put their Difficulties. There we repeat many of the actual words of scholars, sent in answer to this paragraph.

Needless to say, the distinction between these two sections is not absolute. The words used by some of the scholars appear in the second section. Sometimes facts of their experience and their families appear as naturally in the third section, with their words.

Needless to say, also, I cannot, without swelling this book to unmanageable size, put in everything of interest or importance that has come to us on Form A. I must make a small selection as representative as I can. But the forms with their answers, and the tabulations and copies made from them, are being carefully preserved. They will be added to the documents of A.A.C.-S.P.S.L. which are at present in a room of the Bodleian Library for my examination. They will be available for any further study authorized by the Society.

2. The Scholars Travel

The natural opening for a section with the title printed above, is to draw a general picture of the extent to which scholars who answer our letter have in fact travelled, exchanging their countries of origin for new countries and the kind of exchange that they have made.

The first answer to this question is given by Table 2 on p. 105, comparing numbers of displaced scholars by countries of origin and present countries. For this purpose the country of origin means not the country of birth, but that in which the scholar was working when displaced. The present country is that in which he or she is presumably settled.

The table relates only to displaced scholars from or for whom we have had answers on Form A, or letters that can be treated as equivalent. The number of such answers received to the end of 1958 and covered by Table 2, as stated already, is 561, and answers continue to come in, though slowly. Having regard on the one hand to losses through death or change of address, and on the other hand to the number of questions on the form and the care needed—and taken in most cases—to answer them, this is a highly encouraging

result. It is the most general sign of appreciation of what we and others attempted—to save freedom of learning from tyrants.

Naturally the proportion of answers to circulars issued varies from one country to another according to their distance and other factors. It is well over half in Great Britain—174 answers from 291 circulars. It is little less than half for the United States—225 out of 468.

Table 2 as a whole gives a striking picture of what the attack on free learning launched by Hitler in 1933 and carried on by his imitators in tyranny has done to the world at large.

It begins by showing at its top the lasting loss of good brains to Germany, Austria, and a few neighbouring countries—Czechoslovakia, Italy, Poland, Hungary. Though for many years return to Germany and Austria has been open to scholars displaced from them, less than one in seven has returned in fact, 62 out of 459.

The table goes on to show in its lower part how tyranny has enriched with such brains the rest of the world. Altogether twelve countries, running in the table from Germany to the U.S.S.R., suffered some displacement in the past twenty-five years, though one or two, like Belgium and France, have in the end gained more scholars than they lost. Twenty-four countries all over the world, 7 in Europe,¹ 6 in the British Commonwealth, 9 in Central and South America, together with the United Kingdom and the United States, have gained scholars without having any displaced.

The two outstanding gainers are the United Kingdom and the United States. Their combined gain of 399, as shown in the table, just exceeds the net loss of 397 by the two biggest losers, Germany and Austria.

Table 2, comparing countries of origin with present countries, is concerned only with a single wandering, and most scholars on our records, two-thirds or more, were able to re-establish themselves with a single change of home. But more than one in every four found two changes necessary, and some in the past twenty-five years have taught or studied regularly in anything from three to eight separate countries.

The answers to our letters show, for example, Franz David

¹ For this purpose Turkey and Israel are treated as European countries. The 17 European countries are arranged alphabetically in two distinct sections, one of 10 countries with some original displacement and one of 7 countries with no displacement. This throws into relief the contrast between displacing and receiving countries.

TABLE 2. *Countries of Origin and Present Countries of Displaced Scholars*

(From answers to June 1958 Circular received to December 31, 1958)

<i>Countries</i>	<i>Numbers of scholars by countries of origin</i>	<i>Numbers of scholars by present countries</i>
<i>Germany</i>	364	45
<i>Austria</i>	95	17
<i>Other European</i>	102	56
Belgium	4	5
Czechoslovakia	26	1
France	7	9
Holland	2	4
Hungary	22	..
Italy	19	3
Norway	1	1
Poland	17	..
Spain	2	..
U.S.S.R.	2	..
Denmark	..	1
Ireland	..	3
Israel	..	16
Portugal	..	1
Sweden	..	3
Switzerland	..	8
Turkey	..	1
<i>Commonwealth</i>	..	31
Australia	..	12
Canada	..	12
India	..	2
Kenya	..	1
New Zealand	..	3
West Indies	..	1
<i>Central and South America</i>	..	13
Argentina	..	1
Brazil	..	3
Chile	..	1
Columbia	..	1
Ecuador	..	1
Mexico	..	2
Panama	..	2
Peru	..	1
Venezuela	..	1
<i>United Kingdom</i>	..	174
<i>United States</i>	..	225
Grand total	561	561

Bielschowsky, a radiologist and expert on cancer, from Freiburg in Germany, dismissed on racial grounds in May 1933 at the age of thirty-one. He carried on research in turn at Amsterdam for a year, at Madrid for five years from 1934 to 1938, at Sheffield from 1939 to 1947, and since 1948 has been at the University of Otago at Dunedin as Director of Cancer Research for the New Zealand Branch of the British Empire Campaign. Five different countries in fifteen years. He writes to us that the S.P.S.L. grant to him in 1939 was decisive in enabling him to continue as a scientist.

They show Erich Uhlmann, another radiologist, also from Freiburg in Germany, established for more than twenty years in the United States, whose way there was from Germany through Switzerland, Denmark, and Turkey; he is still well below sixty, has three sons, two brothers, and a sister in the United States; he tells us that by leaving Germany early, in May 1933, he has been able to continue research in his chosen field of radiology and cancer under certain difficulties—of being forced to add three different languages, Danish, Turkish, and English, to his original German—'but otherwise most satisfactorily'.

They show Rolf Singer, a botanist, also leaving Germany in 1933, who after a year in Austria, two years in Spain, four in Russia, and seven in the United States, has been for ten years a Professor of Botany in the Argentine. He has worked in six different countries. He is now fifty-two and still an American citizen.

But even he, and the rest, must yield to another competitor for the Wandering Scholar Prize.

This is Guido Beck, a Czech and physicist from the German University of Prague. Leaving this through political difficulties towards the end of 1934 he had a year in the United States as Visiting Professor at Kansas, three years 1935-7 in the U.S.S.R. at Odessa, four years 1938-41 on atomic research at Lyons in France, a year or so in Portugal as Visiting Professor at Coimbra and Porto, and eight years 1943-51 as an astro-physicist at Cordoba in the Argentine. Most men might have thought six new countries sufficient to test as a home. But in 1951 he tried a seventh new country, became Professor of Theoretical Physics at Rio de Janeiro in Brazil, and remains there still at fifty-five, having worked in eight different countries in seventeen years.

This champion wanderer, in commenting on his experience, tells us first how he was helped by five separate funds for displaced

scholars, beginning with the German *Notgemeinschaft* and going on with four other such agencies, in three different countries at least—Sweden, Denmark, and France. He goes on to explain his wandering:

I left Kansas University in 1934 because I became informed before leaving Prague that this invitation was only for one year and could not be extended. I had, therefore, arranged already in 1934 to go, afterwards, to Odessa. I left Odessa, which had offered a permanent position, in 1937, because it became at that time increasingly difficult for a foreigner to do work in the U.S.S.R. I left France in 1941 because of the German occupation. Portugal was only a transitory station for me, I did not intend to stay there longer than necessary in order to find a position in America. Argentina looked very promising to me, but in 1951 the situation under the Peron Government became so difficult in the Universities, that I decided to accept an invitation to Brazil, which offered better conditions.

He ends by comparing the development of science in the regions best known to him: U.S.S.R. and South America.

... The U.S.S.R. started already in 1933 large scale research institutes, South American countries started first, in much smaller scale, after the second world war. The main requirements were, however, the appropriate organisation of research institutes, not individual research, which requires already the existence of certain institutions. Foreign scholars were in general well received, but they obtained very little chance to contribute, in spite of their experience, to the organisational work. Most countries needed scientists, but most countries wanted *national* scientists. In the U.S.S.R. political events and the war made any large scale contribution of foreign scientists impossible. In South America the only contribution which was possible, was the formation of a few young national elements by foreign scientists and first these young scientists, once formed, could take the initiative for the organisation of research centres, for modifications in university teaching, etc. The contribution of emigrated scholars in those countries is, therefore, little visible. Still, it may have, in many cases, shortened the way for the development of science in new countries.

To this record of scholars finding fresh fields of learning activity all over the world, it is right to add as a contrast a few displaced scholars on our list who did not wander at all.

There was, as one instance, Otto Pfeiderer, an economist who, being turned out of his academic post, was offered help by the

A.A.C. to find a similar position abroad, and recalls this with gratitude. Instead of availing himself of this offer he gave up his academic career and, by working in a private firm, was able to stay in Germany without having to sacrifice his convictions. After the war he was happy to have the chance of helping to build up banking again, particularly in helping to reform the currency. He is now President of a very important central bank.

There was Jakob Baxa, a teacher of sociology in the University of Vienna for fifteen years to 1938, when he was dismissed on the grounds that his writings did not suit Alfred Rosenberg. He had fought as a youngster in World War I and lost most of his hearing in grenade fire on the Italian front. Fortunately, in addition to teaching sociology, he was an official of the Austrian sugar industry, and able to keep this post till October 1945, when his deafness became total. Thereafter as a learned writer he has produced six books and 110 articles. He was almost unique on our records as having been displaced from academic work but not needing to leave Austria to find a living.

There was Sigmund Weil, a senior physician and Professor of Orthopaedics in Breslau, dismissed on racial grounds. He did not leave Germany but kept himself and his family alive by becoming a factory worker near Stuttgart. 'I did not emigrate', he tells us, 'because I had a sick child whom no country would accept, and had the good fortune, with my wife and three children, to survive the Hitler period.' He is now, at the age of seventy-seven, a Professor Emeritus in Heidelberg, with one son a doctor in the U.S.A. and another son a government official in Heidelberg.

These three examples of men and their families who survived the Hitler period in Germany or in Austria, coming to us by chance, are examples of the good fortune that even in desperate conditions may wait on courage. They cannot, alas, be taken as typical of what happened to persons of Jewish blood or free opinions who remained in those countries. Our answers from other academic refugees who did get out, with our help or otherwise, abound with references to relations whom they could not rescue, to sons, mothers, and brothers, who fell victims.

One of the questions naturally asked in Form A was how scholars when displaced from their own countries had found their way to other countries to continue their work, and with what help, if any. The answers to this are not always as clear as they might be and it

has seemed unsafe to tabulate them, as this would give a false impression of exactness in the result. But three points stand out clearly. First, the number and variety of agencies offering help to displaced scholars. Second, the number of scholars who found a new home by their own efforts or through friends and relatives. Third, how many who did this and did not need the direct help of any relief agency, express gratitude all the same for the existence of such agencies as giving them moral support against their persecutors.

There are other points on which interesting material is provided by our answers. Most of these points, such as the age distribution of the scholars affected, their publications, and the differences between different countries, I must leave for examination by others later. One point is so important and so human in its interest that something must be said of it at once.

It arises on the question in paragraph VII of Form A, as to children and grandchildren. This question, in nearly every form which reached us, was answered with obvious care wherever there were children or grandchildren, whether the scholar had brought them with him or had brought them into the world in his new country, to become scholars and creative minds in turn. One could write a whole book on this theme alone. A few pages of our records show, for example, a physicist saved from Germany to the United States with four children: two in the same country—one a maker of fine instruments, one married to a physicist; with another daughter married to a social educator in Britain; with another son a research physicist in Australia. They show an economist, moved from Italy to Brazil, able to establish there three sons—economist, chemist, and electrician—in high industrial posts and a daughter as Professor of the French Language. They show a physicist from Germany returned home to his old country from the United States, with two sons established in the States as an Air Force captain and a physicist in industry, with a son and daughter back with him in Germany. They show an archaeologist from Poland now settled in Britain, with four children in four countries, Poland, Germany, Britain, and the U.S.A. Such examples could be multiplied indefinitely, and a few more of special interest appear in the next section.

The loss to tyrants by persecution and the gain to receiving countries by hospitality are growing and continuing ones. More than this, it is impossible to read the answers to Form A without

feeling not only that something has been done to rescue fine brains for continuing service to humanity, but that something has been done also to bring countries together by family relationship.

3. The Scholars Speak their Thanks

The tenor of most of the observations that we have received under paragraph VIII is appreciation of what scholars have gained by escaping from persecution in their own countries, to continue their scholarly work elsewhere, and of gratitude to the various agencies which have helped them in this escape. This appreciation and gratitude came from scholars in every subject, and every country of origin. In one only out of eleven lists of answers, arranged according to the time of receipt by us, I find such thanks from a German anatomist now in Cambridge; a Czech radiologist now in London; a geometrician from Italy now happily back in his own land after five years in Manchester which 'reconciled me with life'; a museums director from Germany now in Philadelphia; a doctor from Vienna just retired from private practice in the U.S.A. whose life and that of his wife were saved by rescue twenty-five years ago; an economist from Italy now in the U.S.A. after two first years of rescue in London; a Professor of Surgery from Spain long established in Oxford. Such examples could be multiplied indefinitely from other lists.

I wish that, on behalf of the various agencies which helped such scholars, I could thank them publicly for the kind and cheering things that they have written to us in answer to our letter. I have, in fact, sent a letter of acknowledgement individually to them and to all the rest who took so much trouble to answer our questions. Here I must be content to print a few answers only, sometimes with names and sometimes without.

I give first two answers expressing in general terms appreciation of their reception in the two countries—United Kingdom and United States—to which most of the displaced scholars went.

Alexander Baykov, once Lecturer in Russian Economics at the Czech University of Prague, now Professor of Economics and Institutions of the U.S.S.R. at the University of Birmingham, writes:

I consider that S.P.S.L. has done exceptionally useful work not only by providing the opportunity for refugee scholars to come to this country and by helping them to restart their academic work, but also by the way

in which this help has been given—with no strings whatever attached to it, and without the slightest psychological pressure on the recipient in order to make him or her feel that they received help. It was such a pleasure to find this attitude compared with the completely different experience of many refugee scholars who were, by circumstances of life, forced to accept financial help in other countries.

Gerhard Colm, once Professor of Economics at Kiel University, now Chief Economist of the National Planning Association and professorial lecturer at the George Washington University, Washington, U.S.A., writes:

It was my good luck that I emigrated very early in 1933, that I was at an age in which adaptation to a new country and a new language was easier than for those of more advanced age, and most of all that I found a country which was most hospitable and gave me and my family every opportunity. If I had to single out two people out of the many who helped me in the process of adaptation, I would name Dr. Alvin Johnson and the late Harold D. Smith, Budget Director and advisor to President Roosevelt.

I could add letters as warm from many other countries. I give, instead, a few letters which, like that of Gerhard Colm, give special thanks to individual helpers:

From B. Katz, once graduating for the M.D. at Leipzig, now since 1952 Professor of Biophysics in London:

I had the good fortune of being able to leave Germany in 1935, almost immediately after graduating and to be taken on as a pupil by A. V. Hill at University College, London. Here I was at once surrounded with opportunities and a human atmosphere far more generous and congenial than I could have hoped for under 'normal' circumstances.

The change which I experienced in that year was not only decisive for my career, but stands out among the happiest events which I remember.

From W. Stark, once Lecturer in the Free School of Political Science in Prague, now, since 1951, Reader in the History of Economic Thought, University of Manchester:

. . . My fortunes, however, only took a radical turn for the better when I met the late Lord Keynes after submitting to him a paper for publication in the *Economic Journal*. It is impossible for me to give an adequate idea of the kindness which he showed me. To him I was a fellow scholar, not a refugee at all, and by his simple and straightforward humanity he immediately re-established my self-respect and confidence

in the future. As you desire us to comment on our experience as wandering scholars you will perhaps forgive me if I say that I have not found the same understanding for my cultural and scholarly ideals again.

From F. T. Epstein, once preparing to be Private Teacher at the University of Frankfurt, now Central European Specialist in the Library of Congress, at Washington:

Establishing new life and career in the U.S.A. is due to the moral and financial support of A.A.C., also education of children to receiving University Degrees which opened an academic career to our son Klaus.

Therefore Mrs. Epstein and I feel under the deepest obligation to the A.A.C. and it is with special gratitude that we shall always remember the help which we received from its Secretary General, Mr. Adams, and his assistants.

From G. S. Fraenkel, once Teacher of Comparative Physiology at the University of Frankfurt, now for ten years Professor of Entomology in the University of Illinois:

. . . The persons who were most immediately concerned with my settling in England were Dr. Julian Huxley, Professor J. B. S. Haldane, and Professor D. M. S. Watson in whose department in University College I found a home first for over two years. England has become my second home, or I may almost say my first, because I have entirely lost spiritual contact with Germany. This has not altered the fact that, entirely for economic reasons, I transferred my activities to the United States in 1948. . . .

To these general or personal thanks let me add a theme appearing repeatedly in our answers, of how much the scholar's life has been enriched by seeing a new country and working in a new society. I must be content to cite seven such answers only out of many that make this point.

From K. P. Wachsmann of Germany, now Anthropologist with the Wellcome Foundation, London, after various posts in Uganda:

It is unlikely that my work in Uganda would have taken the course it did . . . without the opportunity of studying African languages at London University. I did not know a word of English when I arrived.

From H. K. E. Blaschko, driven by Hitler from medical research in Heidelberg to become for the last ten years Senior Research Officer in the Department of Pharmacology at Oxford:

I am certain that for Science and Learning my translation from Germany to England has been beneficial. Personally, the change of environ-

ment has brought me a definite line of research, which I have followed ever since I began, as a grantee of the A.A.C., to follow it in 1935. What little merit there is in my work, it has profited by the change and the coming together of my experience as a learner in Germany and the problems taken up here.

From K. F. M. Helleiner, Economist and Archivist driven from Austria, to become now Associate Professor of Political Economy at Toronto in Canada:

To start a new life past middle age involves certain hardships and losses. In my own case, these were counterbalanced, and more than offset, by the exhilarating experience of a new intellectual environment: an historian, reared in the traditions of German historicism and romanticism, I found myself exposed to the empiricism and Christian humanism of Anglo-Saxon scholarship. To me, emigration has meant not only physical survival, but also an undreamt-of broadening of my intellectual horizon.

From R. G. Reichenberger, once teacher at a secondary school in Offenburg, now at fifty-five and for twelve years past Associate Professor of Romance Languages at the University of Pennsylvania:

The net result of emigration is definitely on the positive side. The imperative need for increased personal energies unlocked energies which otherwise would have remained untapped.

From Liselotte Dieckmann, wife of a university professor in Germany till 1933, since then Lecturer in German and Greek at Istanbul 1934-7, and now Professor of German at Washington University, St. Louis, U.S.A.:

As a woman, and a married woman, I must admit that my chances for an academic career greatly increased through the emigration. I doubt very much that, as the wife of a university professor, I would have had a chance, or perhaps even the desire, to undertake an independent academic career. I would also like to add that the acquiring of a second language and of an entirely new view of scholarly problems has been a challenge and a great enrichment.

From J. Rzoska, once a biologist at the University of Poznan in Poland, just appointed Senior Lecturer at Sir John Cass College in London, after twelve years in Khartoum:

Being forced to change my life at least three times during the last twenty years has proved to be difficult, though on the whole salutary.

Habits of thinking had to be frequently adjusted and great flexibility was required to fit into life and work in Britain (1940-46), Sudan (1946-58) and Britain again (1958-). These exigencies have broadened my ideas and judgments on human and scientific problems.

From Otto Piper, once Professor of Systematic Theology at Münster in Westphalia, now for seventeen years Professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis in the Princeton Theological Seminary, U.S.A.:

It would seem to me that the involuntary exile of so great a number of scholars has served as a most valuable object lesson to the whole world of scholarship. Both the exiles and their hosts were drastically reminded of the fact that our academic training and work was carried on on a rather narrow national basis. The exiles were surprised to find new viewpoints, new methods and above all unknown fellow-workers in their fields of specialization, and their hosts began to realize how useful this kind of massive cross-fertilization was for their own studies. . . .

4. The Scholars Put their Difficulties

The difficulties of wandering scholars were essentially those of readjustment to a new country, with usually a different language and different forms of university organization. Criticisms amounted in most cases to saying that readjustment in the short time available had proved too hard, with suggestions as to how it might have been made easier by a different attitude of someone in the receiving country or of the scholar himself. The someone or other who might with advantage have acted differently in the receiving country was practically never the A.A.C. or other agency that had helped in the scholar's escape to free learning and teaching.

I cannot introduce the subject better than by citing one of the latest answers that I have received. It comes from a scholar once Lecturer on Internal Medicine in the University of Berlin and Assistant Physician at the University Clinic, now a consultant physician in private practice in London:

My personal experiences as a 'wandering scholar' are that—in spite of the helpful efforts made by institutions, such as the A.A.C., and by some individuals, my scientific career came to a complete stand-still and that all my serious efforts to the contrary (research work, publications, etc.) were unsuccessful. A variety of reasons seem to have been responsible for this development.

Initial lack of understanding on the newcomer's part of the differences in approach and of the existing possibilities;

Impaired self-assurance and possibly oversensitivity in the new situation;

Desire for economic security for the sake of the family;

Conscious or sub-conscious resistance on the part of many colleagues to accept the stranger as an equal, to let him share opportunities and to give him access to responsible work.

However, the spirit has not been broken, and it is to the credit of this country that other activities could be developed which have partly replaced what has been lost.

I have cited this scholar, it will be noted, by description, without naming him, and I follow the same course in the rest of this section on Difficulties. In this there are two advantages. First, it is fairer to the scholars themselves not to name them, since they have no further chance of justifying what they have said. Second, it saves space. I can say once and for all that nearly every criticism by a scholar is accompanied by grateful appreciation of what had been attempted to help him.

The difficulties of readjustment varied greatly with the scholar's subject. They were least in the field of pure natural science. They were greater in arts subjects, through language troubles. They were greater also when science was being applied to practical problems, as in the profession of medicine.

For the advantage of the pure natural scientist in wandering it is sufficient to quote one who has been for twenty years a Professor of Mathematical Physics at Birmingham, having been driven from Hamburg in 1933:

... I should stress the impression that my experience as a physicist and therefore as a member of a profession in which international contacts are wide-spread and in which it is particularly easy to transplant one's activities from one country to another, I feel singularly fortunate because I did not have to face many of the problems of readjustment which arise in other professions.

For the greater difficulty in subjects other than pure natural science I cite in turn a lawyer and two doctors.

Here is the lawyer, once a member of the German Judiciary, now for sixteen years a Staff Tutor in International Affairs at the University of Bristol. After declaring himself as personally very fortunate, with an English-born wife and children, and rejecting any idea of

return to Germany, he feels still that many of his early hopes have been defeated by the break of emigration:

. . . I think the pure scientist or even the medical doctor has an easier task because in their field language is a mere instrument but for all those intellectual fields in which language is of primary importance this break is indeed irreparable. However well you learn the new language it is not the language that you have as it were in your blood and although I have written a long book and quite a few articles in English I still feel that I am using the most essential tool that a scholar employs clumsily, and as a result I have written much less than I think I would have done if I still wrote in my mother tongue. I am delighted, however, that my son will not suffer from this disability and I hope that he will write the books which I might have written if I had lived in Germany as a Professor of Constitutional Law.

Here is a Professor of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, once at Vienna, later for ten years in a similar post at the University of Columbia, U.S.A.:

. . . In spite of all possible well-intentioned aid by the 'Society' and other people of good will, it was not easy for most of us to feel at home and to work efficiently during the first few years of our arrival in the new countries. Most of the obstacles we met—fear of competition, prejudice, lack of understanding—sometimes even open hostility—were finally overcome by many of the younger generation, but by comparatively few of the elder scientists. . . .

Here is another doctor, once a researcher on nervous disorders at the University of Frankfurt, and now for sixteen-years pathologist at a hospital in Hertfordshire. He has found appropriate work himself, but has a rather drastic prescription for spiritual workers—humanists, historians, &c., who were not scientists. He had known quite a number of such refugees and 'unless they were really first class their difficulties were very great'.

I have often thought whether towards some of them it would not have been more humane to have been more in-humane, and to advise them to try to find some other line of work when they had not shown any sign of 'settling down' after three or four years. But I may be quite wrong in this, generally and from a rather limited experience.

From their answers to us it is clear that refugee doctors had widely varying experiences, both in the United Kingdom and in the United States. The pathologist just cited managed to settle

happily in this country. On the other hand, a pediatrician from Vienna, emigrating first to Britain, could not continue his medical work there; on going to the United States he passed his examinations and has been doctoring happily for nearly twenty years.

Other medical men in the United States report to us less cheerfully; it seems clear that in that great country with its federal constitution, the difficulties of resettlement in the medical profession vary from one State to another. A psychoanalyst from Vienna, for instance, having made his way to Chicago through Switzerland and London, tells us that he found the psychoanalytic groups in London, New York, and Chicago most helpful and actively supporting, but the State medical societies began soon to make resettlement increasingly difficult for immigrant physicians. A radiologist from Vienna mentioned New York to us as one of the few States in which a foreign medical man had any chance at all. But by joining the government service and moving west he has found full professional activity and happiness in Arizona.

All I can say in general terms of the medical men reporting to us on our circular is that if they could not make good in one way they generally did so in another way.

A doctor, for instance, dismissed from a Berlin hospital in 1933, after trying Switzerland for a few years, thought it better to move on to England. Despite an M.D. and a Triple Joint Diploma he was not admitted to any post in the Services or in research. But he became Assistant Medical Officer in one of our large towns and has held this post for seventeen years, some early opposition to his race and nationality having died down. And he is still able to do research relevant to his job, though he describes the attitude to research in public administration as 'rather limited'.

Another doctor and Professor of Medicine dismissed in Berlin, on arriving in the United States found himself 'completely unable to continue research'. But having had a private practice also in Berlin, he set out to build a new practice in New York. This, according to his son, telling us about him after his death, 'he accomplished with conspicuous success, but except for an occasional clinical paper to the Virchow Society, he accomplished nothing else'. It may be added that the son thus filling up his father's form is himself an Assistant Professor of Medicine in Canada.

Yet another doctor, coming to us this time from Austria, was employed in London during the war as obstetrician and gynaeco-

logist, but worked also as a general practitioner under the health scheme. 'The wide field of general medicine became so interesting that I gave up the idea of returning to Vienna. I feel happier as a G.P. than I ever did before.'

Making good in a new way if one could not do so in one's old way applied to emigrants other than doctors. I have mentioned already one practising lawyer from Germany who, despite language difficulties, contrived to establish himself as a teacher in international affairs, and there were other lawyers like him.

Sometimes also, not being able in a new country to do just what one liked to do in one's old country was not, in material terms, a loss. Witness a former school teacher in Germany, now Associate Professor of Anatomy in Chicago:

I prepared myself in Germany to be a secondary school teacher. I had the hope to become headmaster of a private boarding school (as my father had been). During my years as an apprentice teacher in Germany, I continued research in histology and embryology. When emigrating to Italy, being a foreigner, I could not become a teacher in a secondary school. Therefore, the academic career was the only one open to me. Forced to emigrate a second time, and after arriving in the U.S.A., I found it to be impossible for a person with a doctor's degree to find a position teaching children. The American pedagogues, with few exceptions, regard with suspicion teachers who are specialists in the subjects which they teach. Therefore, also in America, the academic career was the only one open to me. . . .

I have taught in a grammar school during recent years without pay, because with children I am most happy.

Thus, emigration has 'kicked me upstairs'.

Sometimes also, even outside natural science, the difference between German and English as mother tongue is unimportant. Witness Rudolf Pfeiffer, dismissed from the Chair of Greek at Munich in July 1937. He was invited at once to Campion Hall in Oxford and found in that city, in his own words, 'a second home'. He found there a Professor of Latin, Eduard Frankel, also of German origin.

I shall never forget the feeling of relief when at the beginning of 1938 I escaped from a completely mad city like Munich to the tranquility of Oxford and to a country where liberty and reason still existed. . . . Although I was teaching nearly all the time from 1939 until 1951 I was able to concentrate on my research work and to publish the two very big

volumes of Callimachus. On the papyri in Queen's, the treasures of the Bodleian, many learned friends made it possible to finish the work. . . .

Though back at Munich again since 1951, as Professor or Professor Emeritus, this scholar returns to Oxford nearly every year. For some purposes there is something in the classics after all.

The general effect of these 561 answers from displaced scholars in nearly every quarter of the world is cheering in the extreme. This does not mean that tragedies do not appear in them. Every now and again comes a moving reference to parents, brothers, sisters, and others whose lives it proved possible to save, while others went to their fate.

And now and again comes a story with an unhappy end. I cannot give a better example than that in the only answer which has come to me from a displaced scholar whose country of origin was in the U.S.S.R. Dismissed in May 1921 from the chair of mathematics in the University of Erivan, Professor Ervand George Kogbetliantz writes to us today as follows:

During 1921-42 lived and worked in France. From 1942—in U.S.A. In 1927 after having studied geophysical methods of prospecting for oil and minerals in Germany founded and was appointed general Manager of the first French company 'Ste de Prosp. Géophysique' which introduced in France gravimetric and magnetic methods. In 1933 was sent by French Government on an official mission to Teheran to help Iranian Government in organising the first Univ. Volunteered and fought the Second World War, as a private in the French Ordnance.

Taught Mathematics as *Instructor*(!) in Lehigh Univ. (1942-4) and Columbia Univ. (1947-56). Consulting Geophysicist at Standard Oil Development Co. in 1945-56.

May I call your attention on the following illustration of a general situation of displaced scientists and teachers: After 46 years of teaching in *four* countries (and 3 continents) I have no pension and am obliged to work hard at my 70 years of age.

5. Choice between Old and New Countries

As was shown earlier in this chapter, more than six out of every seven of the scholars driven from Germany or Austria, the two chief countries of origin, have preferred to remain in their new countries. So did nearly all those from Italy. Of the many illustrations of this choice that could be given from Form A, it will be sufficient to print three only, one from among those who decided for their new

country, another from one who has returned to Germany, the third from an Italian who feels slightly uncertain sometimes.

The first comes from Nikolaus Pevsner, Lecturer at the University of Göttingen, who became Slade Professor of Fine Art at Cambridge from 1948 to 1955:

Wandering scholar? Thanks to the generosity and the openmindedness of this country, there was no wandering—only a removal to more sympathetic surroundings. I have had two or three enquiries from Germany in the last few years, whether I would go back and occupy a chair, but our family is here, and our life and my job are here. We have after all lived in London longer than in any other single town.

The second comes from Max Born, one of the most distinguished physicists in the world. Dismissed from his professorship at Göttingen more than twenty-five years ago, he has been since then, with many other activities, Stokes Lecturer at Cambridge, Guest Professor of the Institute of Science at Bangalore, and Tait Professor of Natural Science at Edinburgh. At the age of seventy-five he writes as follows:

Through the generosity of the S.P.S.L. and the British Universities, in particular Cambridge and Edinburgh, I have found a second home in Great Britain and was able to give my children a good education. All my ten grandchildren have been born in Great Britain and have English as their mother tongue. I am deeply grateful for all this. After my reaching the age limit I have retired to my home country, partly for economical, partly for sentimental reasons. But I have retained my British nationality.

Of Max Born's daughters one is married to the President of Ormond College in Melbourne, and another is married to a Professor of Physics in Bristol, while his son is a member of the Nuffield Institute for Medical Research in Oxford. Those grandchildren should be splendid stuff!

It is pleasant and encouraging to add that of Nikolaus Pevsner's two sons, one, after a scholarship course at Trinity, Cambridge, is already directing film studios, and the other is doing postgraduate research at Oxford after a scholarship course at Christ Church, while his daughter is an A.R.I.B.A.

The third, received only as this book was going to press, comes from Leo Finzi, once Professor of Engineering at the University of Naples, now at the Institute of Technology in Pittsburg, U.S.A. In his answer on our Form A, he begins by appreciating deeply the

moves made by the S.P.S.L. to secure for him an appointment at Benares in India when racial laws drove him from Italy. S.P.S.L. succeeded, but the Indian appointment took so long that when the offer of appointment reached him, he was already in the United States, and there he still is, with a full-time position in the Carnegie Institute of Technology.

Altogether I have been very fortunate in my scientific career. I am now a 'top man' in one of the best schools of engineering in the United States. Probably my life as a Professor in Italy would be much more leisurely and often, when I am very tired, I wonder. But on a more sober appraisal, I *am* lucky.

7. Folly of Tyrants

IN ONE CHAPTER AFTER ANOTHER I have placed on record individual cases of brains and service lost to their native countries by tyranny, and saved for continuing service of mankind in countries that were free. In this chapter I tell in outline what one country—my own—has gained in this way by remaining free.

While World War II was raging the Society for the Protection of Science and Learning was too busy to talk of what it was doing, or failing to do. Our Fourth Report was issued in November 1938. Our Fifth Report, issued in 1946, covered the years from 1939 to 1945.

As one preparation for this Report, in November 1945, we addressed a circular to each of the 600-odd refugee scholars who were still in Britain.¹ From this we compiled and printed a War Service List of 424 names, arranged in the following main groups:

Service in the Armed Forces	30
Research for Department of Scientific and Industrial Research and other Government Departments	63
University Teaching and Research (Science 41, Medicine 31, Humanities 39—teaching only)	111
Miscellaneous, including B.B.C. 21, Medical work in Hos- pitals 20, Research in Medical Subjects 23, Humanities Research 25, Economic and Social Research 15, Workers in Field of Art 18, Musicians 5	220

The first group of 30 were necessarily all volunteers, accepted for service when the war was well advanced. It includes two who died on active service: E. Rothbarth, a private in the Suffolk Regiment, killed near Venlo in December 1944, and H. O. Ziegler, who, after volunteering for the Czech Army on outbreak of the war, joined the R.A.F., was reported missing on May 4, 1944, and is known now to have been killed.

The second group of 63 included 12 engaged on research for the atomic bomb. The actual number on such work was greater; a few

¹ Since 1945 some of the displaced scholars then in Britain returned to their countries of origin or emigrated to other countries, so that the total remaining here is about 500, as stated on p. 124.

scholars asked to be excluded from our list altogether because of the secret nature of their work, while others engaged on work still on the secret list are classified as academic teachers rather than researchers. Apart from the atomic bomb, the departments in which refugees worked as researchers in the war included Admiralty, Air Ministry, Combined Operations, Foreign Office, Information, Supply, Medical Research Council, and many more.

The large Miscellaneous group included nearly everything from Civil Defence to Anti-Locust Research.

The list of 1946 as a whole, in the words of the Fifth Report, stands as 'an eloquent testimony to the valuable services which refugee scholars and scientists have rendered to this country during the war'. It gives also some of the distinctions, civil and academic, already gained by refugees and marking their value to Britain. But such information is reserved best till it can be given up to date.

At the moment of my writing this—October 1958—there are 32 Fellows of the Royal Society and 3 Foreign Members of the Society who were displaced scholars. There are 17 Fellows and 6 Corresponding Fellows of the British Academy. There are four Nobel Prize winners since 1933: Professor Max Born from Breslau, Professor Ernst B. Chain from Berlin, Professor Sir Hans A. Krebs from Freiburg, and Professor F. A. Lipmann from Berlin and Heidelberg.¹ One of the 35 Fellows of the Royal Society, Professor W. K. Hayman, now a Professor of Pure Mathematics in the University of London, was hardly himself an established scholar when he reached Britain. He was brought by his father to take refuge here; he is a F.R.S. of the second generation whom we owe to Hitler. We look forward to having more like him.

Turning to Civil Honours, we count, from Germany or other persecuting countries, two Knights, five Companions and two Officers of the British Empire. In the academic field we can count sixty-four Professors in British universities, divided about equally between Arts and Science, to say nothing of those in other parts of the British Commonwealth, in the United States, or in other lands which have no dictators, open or veiled.

All these have been lost to tyrants and won for service in freedom.

¹ The last of these was not a refugee physically, for he was out of Germany on research in Copenhagen in 1933 when the Hitler attack began. But as he would certainly not have been allowed to stay in Germany if he had tried to return, he is among those lost to tyranny. He is now a Member and Professor of Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research in New York.

It is pleasant to remember how many of these scholars who might have returned to their countries of origin in freedom and honour when World War II was over, have preferred instead to settle and serve in Britain. It is sad to remember that to a few of these scholars return to freedom in their countries of origin was not open when the war was over and is not open today. Tyranny still rules a large part of the world, and freedom of learning needs defence as much as ever.

From this history of attack on free learning and defence of free learning in the past twenty-five years, one simple moral emerges for the future: a moral as to the relative importance of money and of ideas.

The Academic Assistance Council and its successor S.P.S.L. in their first six years were always short of money. I was disappointed in those years that my friends of the Rockefeller Foundation would not solve our financial problem of defending free learning for us, with a stroke of their dollar wand, as they had solved the financial problem of London's University Site in 1926, had solved one problem after another of the London School of Economics and Political Science from 1924 onwards, and had solved several problems about my personal research. But, as I have told in Chapter 1, other great foundations were as cautious as my Rockefeller friends about helping us directly to answer Hitler's attack, and some of them proved wholly negative. In practice, the Rockefeller Foundation, from 1933 onwards, provided very substantial grants towards maintenance of refugee scholars both here and in other countries, and they helped our cause still more by the immense sums that came pouring out from them for university work in general. On the latest new outburst of persecution of free learning—in Hungary in 1956—they acted instantly, appropriating well over \$1,200,000 for those aspects of the Hungarian refugee problem which they accepted as a special opportunity.¹

We, on our side, though living for years from hand to mouth, were never prevented by lack of funds from doing anything essential. We never, I think, failed for want of money to help any refugee scholar, where help was demanded either by his proved achievement or by his promise. Today some 500 displaced scholars are

¹ Further details are given on pp. 16–18 of *The President's Review*, from the Rockefeller Foundation Annual Report for 1956.

established in Britain and many more of such scholars are established in other countries, some with our help and some without it, maintaining themselves, helping the less fortunate, rendering service to humanity.

Yet with all this accomplished and with Hitler dead, the need for organized defence of free learning remains, and defence is in some ways more difficult than before. Post-war tyrants, as savage as the old ones, have become more efficient as jailers; they make it harder for their victims to escape. Protection of Science and Learning is as necessary today as it was twenty-five years ago. At any moment it may need money once more, and if the emergency occurs I have no doubt that believers in freedom will come to its help again.

Money is a necessary instrument. But the moral of this book is that, for getting things done, money is less important than good ideas and determination to put ideas into action. Let us keep ideas free for ourselves and, so far as we can, for others.

APPENDIX

1. Note on American Experience with Academic Refugees

THE account of the Emergency Committee in the United States, given by Stephen Duggan and Betty Drury in *The Rescue of Science and Learning* (Macmillan Company, New York, 1948), should be read as a whole, and particularly its longest single chapter (IX) where, in response to a circular letter, *The Displaced Scholars Speak for Themselves*. A few points of special interest from other chapters, to compare with British experience, are noted below.

The opening letter on behalf of the Committee to American Universities made three main points:

1. No money should be asked for from the universities themselves, in the intense depression which they, with U.S.A. as a whole, were suffering in 1933.
2. Invitation to academic refugees should be limited to men of professorial standing or as put elsewhere (p. 186), to scholars of such eminence that there would be no thought of competition between them and young Americans. Younger refugees might, it was suggested, be cared for in Western Europe with aid from foundations (p. 174).
3. Appointments should be for three years at most, without commitment either of the university or of the Committee beyond that time.

The financial support of the Emergency Committee 'came almost exclusively from prominent Jewish Foundations' (p. 188). That is to say, these foundations enabled the Committee to match the money provided by such bodies as the Rockefeller Foundation.

Ultimately, out of a total of 613 university personnel known to the Emergency Committee through its own files, plus another 70-odd academicians learned about otherwise, 459 found opportunity to teach or to research in U.S.A. colleges or institutions. Of this total of nearly 700 the number assisted by the Emergency Committee itself was 335.

The Emergency Committee began as a Committee in aid of Displaced German Scholars only, and though in 1938 it substituted 'Foreign' for 'German' in its title, this change was explained as meaning aid 'to refugee professors from all countries of Western Europe overrun by the Nazi

armies' (p. 77). Nevertheless, the Committee seems to have given some help to academics from other countries. And it is of interest that the Institute of International Education of which Stephen Duggan was Director had placed 600 refugees from the Bolsheviks in the years 1917 to 1933 (p. 6).

The Emergency Committee in the U.S.A. (described below as A.E.C.), like A.A.C.—S.P.S.L. in Britain, confined its aid to academics, i.e. gave no help to lawyers, doctors, civil servants, and other professional persons displaced by Hitler and his imitators. But through the initiative of Dr. Alfred Cohn, one of the original committee of A.E.C., there was established also, before the end of 1933, an Emergency Committee for Displaced German Physicians.

With both these Committees the A.A.C. and S.P.S.L. were in close co-operation, and our documents contain a bulky file of correspondence year by year from 1933 to 1937, generally between our secretary Walter Adams and E. R. Murrow of the A.E.C. or Alfred Cohn of the Committee for Displaced Physicians.

The detailed co-operation consisted largely of A.A.C. sending names and qualifications of suitable refugees on their books, when A.E.C. had found a university on the look-out for one; the rule of waiting for universities to ask for a teacher instead of inviting them to find places for scholars in need was applied strictly. The rule accorded with the atmosphere in which the American committees had to work.

As early as the spring of 1934, in a memorandum for public distribution, the A.E.C. admitted 'evidence of prejudices and even intolerance in our country'. A year later, in a letter to Walter Adams, E. R. Murrow put the matter bluntly:

The thing that really concerns me over here is the general indifference of the university world and the smug complacency in face of what has happened to Germany. There is a tendency to consider the matter as a Jewish problem and a failure to realise that it represents a threat to academic freedom in this country as well as in Europe. Part of this attitude undoubtedly has its roots in a latent anti-Semitism which in my judgment is increasing very rapidly.

In the spring of 1935 a representative of the A.E.C. begged the A.A.C. to stop sending any more displaced scholars to the United States, because the country was already as full of such people as it could hold. We could not accept this appeal literally, but we took to paying fares or return fares to the States to individuals who could convince us that they had a real chance of a job there, if they were on the spot to pursue it. And we agreed, soon after, to make no further approach to American foundations except after consultation with the A.E.C.

Almost at the same time, Dr. Kotschnig, after a visit to the United States on behalf of the League High Commissioner for Refugees,

confirmed the difficulty of finding positions for refugee scholars there. He estimated that there would be places for not more than thirty more refugee scholars in the United States in the next few years.

In realizing the less sympathetic atmosphere in which the American agencies for relief of scholars had to work at first, as compared with our own experience, it is essential to recognize one important cause of this difference—physical distance. Hitler was at the door of every nation in Europe; there was the width of the Atlantic and more between him and most of those who lived in the United States. It needed the spread of persecution in 1938 to make money for refugees easy in England. The same spreading brought the United States into the van of battle against persecution, at Evian.

I cannot end this brief note on American experience without citing the passage which Dr. Duggan and Miss Drury quote on page 59 of their book, from Mr. Thomas B. Appleget, Vice-President of the Rockefeller Foundation.

If there is any nucleus of international goodwill and understanding left in the world, it resides, I think, in scientific personnel. They will be the first to mend the broken wires of communications, and I hope this time all the world will realize, whether we like it or not, we have to live together on a globe which science has made too small for war.

These words may fitly be set beside the words of A. V. Hill printed in my first chapter (p. 23): 'Science is a common interest of mankind.' Science brings scientists together. Will it never bring politicians together also?

2. Note on Emergency Society of German Scholars Abroad (*Notgemeinschaft*)

THIS Society, noticed briefly in Chapter 1 as one of the two rescue organizations with whom A.A.C.—S.P.S.L. collaborated most often, has the distinction of having been created by one of the scholars who had just been displaced himself.

Professor Philip Schwartz, Hungarian by birth but holding a Chair of General Pathology and Pathological Anatomy at Frankfurt-am-Main in Germany, was an immediate victim of Hitler's racial persecution and went in March 1933 to Zürich in Switzerland. There he founded at once the *Notgemeinschaft* and directed it for six months, during which he was entrusted by the Turkish Government with the task of establishing the new University of Istanbul. He went there himself as head of its

Pathological Institute for twenty years. In that period he was instrumental in founding a medical school at Ankara, and became general adviser to the Turkish Government on the recruiting, not of university teachers only, but of scientific and government specialists of many kinds.

I personally was able to engage, directly or indirectly, about 250 first-rate scientists (émigrés) for the Turkish Government. My friends, active in every governmental and organizational field, changed profoundly the face of Turkey, giving a mighty impulse to similar developments in the surrounding Mussulman countries. . . .

The number of renowned scientists now working in many different countries, who came in 1933 to Istanbul as young assistants, is remarkably large.

So Professor Schwartz summed up his experience in the reply which he sent to our circular of June last, from the Warren State Hospital in Pennsylvania, U.S.A., where he has worked for the past five years.

Professor Schwartz's departure to Istanbul before the end of 1933 made it necessary to find a successor to him in the direction of the *Notgemeinschaft*. That organization was fortunate in falling into the hands of Dr. Fritz Demuth, whom, from the beginning to end, we and others in the same field found co-operative in every way.

As Dr. Demuth pointed out in an interesting article published by him seven years ago in *Deutsche Rundschau* (Ruhr-Verlag, Gelsenkirchen) the *Notgemeinschaft* had no financial resources to compare with those of the American Emergency Committee or the Society for the Protection of Science and Learning; for money it had to depend almost wholly on contributions from displaced scholars whom it had helped to re-establish. But by its personal knowledge of the scholars themselves and by using its contacts with universities everywhere, it rendered invaluable service.

3. Memorandum on Formation of S.P.S.L.

1. On the establishment of the present régime in Germany in the spring of 1933 and the dismissal or putting into retirement of a number of distinguished university teachers, either on grounds of opinion or on grounds of race, the Academic Assistance Council was formed (in May 1933) with a view to finding for those so displaced opportunities of continuing their scientific work in various institutions in this country or elsewhere.

2. The Academic Assistance Council (under the Presidency of Lord

¹ Memorandum approved by the Executive Committee on 19th December 1935 for submission to the Council recommending the formation of a Society for the Protection of Science and Learning.

Rutherford) has succeeded in the past two and a half years both in finding more or less permanent places (in Britain and outside it) for a number of those displaced from Germany, and in providing temporary maintenance for many others. Of the approximately 700 scholars who have left Germany, 348 have already been permanently re-established and 324 are being temporarily supported in universities while continuing their research. A feature of this work has been the ready co-operation which the Council has secured from practically all university institutions in giving an opportunity to those displaced of continuing their scientific and learned pursuits. Assistance from the Council has been dependent in every case upon some university or similar institution being willing to offer this opportunity. In other words it has been confined to those who would be accepted by academic institutions as men of proved academic standing.

3. At the time when the Council was formed, it was not certain that proscription of 'non-Aryans' and of persons of independent thought in Germany would be permanent. The work of the Council, it was hoped, might be required only to meet a temporary need. It was hard to believe that the cultural traditions of Germany would be abandoned completely. It is now clear that there is little hope of early amelioration of the attitude of the German authorities in this matter. Everyone who has any direct contact with Germany can cite cases of men of science and learning who have no opportunity of continuing their work in Germany, and even if they have resources there, are unable, under the exchange restrictions, to transfer money out of Germany. They cannot use such resources as they have, either to make a fresh start for themselves or to give their children the education and the chance in life which they can no longer get in the country where they were born or where they have been living for many years.

4. It has to be added that dismissal of scholars and scientists on political grounds or other grounds irrelevantly to their work is not confined to Germany. In Russia and Italy freedom of study and teaching in large portions of the field of learning has long been proscribed. Within the past year in Portugal a number of university teachers in various faculties have been retired on grounds of political opinion.

5. In the circumstances there is clear need of a continuing organization for the defence of science and learning against attacks such as those from which they are suffering in Germany and elsewhere. The specific suggestion now made is that the Academic Assistance Council should establish as its permanent successor a 'Society for the Protection of Science and Learning' and that all those who now form the Academic Assistance Council should be invited to become the first Council of this Society with power to add to their number.

6. The Society would be incorporated as a company limited by guarantee, to carry on all the varied forms of help which have been given by the Academic Assistance Council in the finding of permanent openings whether in this country or elsewhere for those displaced, and in providing grants for maintenance, travelling expenses, costs of publication, costs of special lectures, emergency relief, loans, &c., to suit the special circumstances of each case. It would administer through the Council, an 'Academic Assistance Trust' for the granting of fellowships and studentships tenable at Universities and other approved institutions for teaching and research in this or other countries, by persons who, on grounds of race, religion, or opinion have been prevented from carrying on learned or scientific work for which they are qualified. Promises of funds over a period of years for the establishing of fellowships and other purposes have already been made to the Academic Assistance Council and these would be transferred to the Trust. While the main purpose of the Trust would be to provide fellowships and studentships over a period of years, its deed would be so drawn as not to preclude the giving of grants for shorter periods.

7. The Funds of the Academic Assistance Trust would be invested in the names of four or five Trustees. These should be persons of distinction whose names as Trustees would secure the confidence of the public, but who would not be required to take an active part in the work of the Society. Some of these should be asked to serve in virtue of office, e.g. the President of the Royal Society, the President of the British Academy, and the Archbishop of Canterbury, but there should also be some trustees by name, e.g. Lord Rutherford, Lord Macmillan, and Lord Horder.

8. All those who are interested in the Protection of science and learning would be invited by public appeal or by letter to join the Society (a) with a minimum annual subscription to be continued until further notice of one guinea a year; (b) with a larger annual subscription if they can afford it; (c) with an undertaking to covenant with the Trustees of the Academic Assistance Trust for a seven-year contribution to the funds of the Trust, thus allowing income-tax to be recovered by the Trustees.

9. The members of the Society would receive an annual report, and if, as suggested, the Society is incorporated by guarantee under the Companies' Act, it would be necessary to provide for an annual meeting. Such a meeting would be a good opportunity for publicity. Though the purpose of the Society would not be propaganda but practical assistance, the existence of the Society and the need for it, must be kept before the public attention. The actual affairs of the Society would be managed by the Council which would have power to co-opt and to delegate powers to an Executive Committee and officers.

10. Gifts to the Trust could be either general or earmarked for the estab-

lishment of fellowships or studentships bearing the name of the donor, or for other specific purposes. The funds of the Society could be used either for the Trust or for its other forms of assistance. The administrative expenses both of the Trust and of the Society would be paid out of the income of the Society.

Note:

The Executive Committee considered two alternative schemes for the continuation of the work of the Council, the first for a Society administering a trust and having other functions of its own, the second for an Academic Assistance Trust alone. The Committee preferred the first scheme for the following reasons:

- (a) People more naturally become members of a 'society' than of a 'trust'. It is hoped that the appeal setting up a permanent organization ready to step in with remedial measures (and make a special appeal if necessary) as occasion arises, may secure a large number of small subscribers continuing from year to year.
- (b) The local assistance committees which exist in many places could naturally become branches of the national society.
- (c) The existence of the Society to bear the necessary administrative expenses will make it possible to avoid throwing any of these on the Trust Funds.
- (d) While it is desirable to preserve the goodwill of the Academic Assistance Council's name, it is desirable also to indicate the need for a new departure—a permanent association of persons of good will to deal with a continuing evil. The 'Academic Assistance Trust' will in effect continue the old name.
- (e) A Society, with widely drawn articles of association could experiment with various new forms of academic assistance, more easily than a Trust, the deed of which would not allow such flexibility.

4. Meetings and Lectures for Appeal of February 1939

<i>Centre</i>	<i>Speakers and Chairmen</i>	<i>Date</i>
Birmingham	Mr. Philip Guedalla The Vice-Chancellor	Feb. 17
Bristol	Professor P. M. S. Blackett, F.R.S. The Vice-Chancellor	Feb. 6

<i>Centre</i>	<i>Speakers and Chairmen</i>	<i>Date</i>
Cambridge	Earl Winterton, P.C., M.P. Professor A. V. Hill, O.B.E., Sec.R.S. The Vice-Chancellor The Mayor of the City	Feb. 8
Hull	Professor Gilbert Murray, F.B.A. The Vice-Chancellor	Feb. 6
Leeds	Professor Winifred Cullis, C.B.E. Mr. T. Edmund Harvey, M.P. The Vice-Chancellor Mr. E. H. Partridge	Feb. 6
Liverpool	Sir William Bragg, O.M., P.R.S. The Vice-Chancellor Sir Christopher Clayton, C.B.E.	Feb. 14
Bedford College, London	Professor Gilbert Murray, F.B.A. The Principal	Feb. 9
Birkbeck College, London	Professor P. M. S. Blackett, F.R.S. Miss Rebecca West The Principal	Feb. 7
University College, London	Sir Samuel Hoare, G.C.S.I., M.P. The Marquess of Reading, K.C. Sir Peter Chalmers Mitchel, F.R.S. His Grace the Archbishop of York	Feb. 6
Queen Mary College, London	Sir Bernard Pares, K.B.E. The Principal	Feb. 7
Royal Holloway College	Sir Allen Mawer, F.B.A. The Principal	Feb. 10
Westfield College	Sir Norman Angell The Principal	Feb. 7
Institute of Education, London	Professor J. B. S. Haldane, F.R.S. The Director	Feb. 17
Manchester	Mr. Walter Adams, B.A. The Vice-Chancellor Sir Kenneth Lee	Feb. 8
Nottingham	Dr. A. D. Lindsay, C.B.E.	Feb. 9
Oxford	Viscount Samuel, P.C., G.C.B. Sir John Hope Simpson, K.B.E. The Vice-Chancellor The Mayor of the City	Feb. 10
Southampton	Professor John Macmurray, M.A.	Feb. 21
Glasgow	Sir Henry H. Dale, C.B.E., F.R.S. The Principal	Feb. 7
Belfast	Sir Joseph Barcroft, C.B.E., F.R.S.	Feb. 8 or 9

5. Circular Letter of June 1958 to Scholars on S.P.S.L. Register

SOCIETY FOR THE PROTECTION OF SCIENCE
AND LEARNING

c/o Society for Visiting Scientists,
5, Old Burlington Street,
London, W. 1.

June 1958.

Dear Colleague,

As one of the originators of the Academic Assistance Council under the Presidency of Lord Rutherford in 1933, and now President of the Society for the Protection of Science and Learning which succeeded it four years later, I have been asked by the Society to write an account of its work and that of the Academic Assistance Council in the past twenty-five years.

I have agreed gladly to do so, for the efforts and achievements of the Council and Society in helping men and women of science and learning represent to me a gleam of light in a world of growing intolerance and despotism.

The Council and Society, of course, have not been alone in this effort. We have co-operated with other bodies formed for the same purpose in many countries. We have found a ready response to our efforts in free Universities throughout the world. We have helped victims of attacks on science and learning not only in Nazi Germany, but in Italy, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Spain, Portugal and Russia.

We have on our register the names of 2,500 University teachers and researchers reported to us as requiring to find employment for their abilities in countries other than their own. For many of these we have been able ourselves to arrange new openings. Many have found openings through other agencies or by their own efforts.

The history of our efforts is in our records. But in judging of results it has seemed to us of great value to draw also on the experience of those whom we were asked to help. I write to you accordingly, as one of the 2,500 on our register, to invite your co-operation if, *but only if*, you feel inclined to give it.

You will find attached to this letter of mine a Form A, resembling the form which many of us have filled in for books of reference—'Who's

Who', 'Wer Ists', and so on—but adapted to the special purpose now in view.

One of the principal adaptations is in giving more space to the children and close relations of the person to whom the form is sent; we should like to know how far our efforts may have helped to keep inherited ability and family tradition alive and serviceable in the world.

Another difference is in the final 'General' heading. There, if you so desire, you can place on record with us, in your own words, your experience as a wandering scholar and your judgment on it.

We have, of course, no intention of publishing an individual 'Who's Who' of you and other recipients. We ask only for such help as you care to give us for completing our picture of 25 years. I shall be grateful for any help. Whether you feel able to help or not, may I give you my good wishes in your new life.

Sincerely yours,
Lord Beveridge

SOCIETY FOR THE PROTECTION OF SCIENCE
AND LEARNING

c/o Society for Visiting Scientists,
5, Old Burlington Street,
London, W. 1.

FORM A

June 1958

1. The filling of this form is a contribution to the work of the Society for the Protection of Science and Learning for the purpose described in Lord Beveridge's letter.
2. Entries may be made in English, French, German or any other language preferred by the recipient of the form.
3. Information supplied on this form will be used to produce a general picture of the work and the places to which displaced scholars have gone, rather than to describe individual experiences or to give lists of names, other than of those who have obtained outstanding distinctions (Nobel Prize, F.R.S., F.B.A. and the like). Some individual names will naturally appear in the narrative, and it would be helpful if those who for any reason do not wish their names to be published would say so here.
4. Those who return Form A are invited to say if they would like to receive a notice of the book before publication and of the terms on which it could be obtained.

- I. Surname (Block Letters)
Other Names (Block Letters)
Country of Origin
Date of Birth
Present Address (Block Letters)

- II. Last Position Held Before Leaving Country of Origin
Date and Reasons of Leaving
Whether through A.A.C.-S.P.S.L., or with help of any other agency

- III. Present Position (giving name of Institution or Employer)
How long held

- IV. Other Positions held between II and III

- V. Academic and Other Distinctions (with dates if possible)

- VI. Principal Books and Other Writings (with dates if possible)

- VII. Family:
Children now living, with present ages and academic careers, occupations, and distinctions

Grandchildren or other close relations affected by change of country

- VIII. General: i.e. any other information as to experiences before and after leaving country of origin which the recipient feels may be of interest for the purposes named in Lord Beveridge's letter.

Index

Abercrombie, Prof. Lascelles, LL.D., 5.
Abyssinia, 45.

Academic Assistance Council: purpose of, ix, 18; officials of, x-xi; appeals for money, ix, 4, 8, 31-32, 44-45, 47-48, 68; inception of, 2, 3, 18, 27; Lord Rutherford President, 2; memorandum and appeal for establishment drafted, 2; agreed by Royal Society, 3; author and Prof. C. S. Gibson Hon. Secs., 3; Burlington House gives rooms, 4; announcement of birth, 3-5; first meeting, 6; officials elected, 6; good response from universities, 7; 'specialized labour exchange', 7; letter to universities, June 1933, 8; Allocation Committee Meetings, 9, 34; contacts pursued, 9-10, 13-17; Albert Hall meeting, Einstein speaks, 10; other meetings, 10; Carrs Lane sermon, 11-12; local committees set up, 17; annual reports giving contemporary position, 18; scope limited to academics, 18-19; aims accepted, 19-20; first Executive Committee, 20; financial difficulties, 24; pessimism of Second Report, 24, leads to establishment of S.P.S.L. as successor to A.A.C., with Trust Fund and permanent organization, 25; announced by Lord Rutherford March 1936, 25-26; growing need for S.P.S.L., 29, leads to informal International Meeting, 29-30; letter to *The Times*, 32; individual treatment of cases, 33; Cambridge Allocation Committee, 34, 62, 97; Sir John Clapham Chairman, 34; grants made, 34-38, 63-67, 96-97; summary of help given, 39; those helped contrasted with those displaced, 39; A.A.C. would not bar Germany from League of Nations, 45; death of Lord Rutherford, 45; William Temple succeeds, 46; contacts with other relief organizations, 46; D. Cleghorn Thomson becomes Secre-

tary to organize appeal, 47; outbreak of war leads to: government assistance, 48, 53-54, 67-68; move to Cambridge, 51; internment of refugees, 51; Miss Simpson succeeds D. C. Thomson, 52; fewer unemployed refugees, 54; interneers ask for personal references, 58; 518 cases prepared for tribunals, 58; greater variety of countries of origin, 67; finance improves, better employment and government aid, 67; first post-war meeting, 91; summary of position, 91-92; Czechs and Poles added, 92; dismissals world-wide reported, 92; help given with naturalization, 93; pensions unsuccessfully sought, 95; gift from Huntingdon Grammar School, 97; Prof. Gibson resigns as Hon. Sec., 97-98; Prof. R. S. Hutton becomes Hon. Sec., 98; Miss Ursell becomes Secretary, 98; death of Sir John Clapham, 98; Prof. A. V. Hill succeeds, 98; death of Prof. M. Greenwood, 98; Dr. Salaman succeeds, 49-55, 98; Prof. R. S. Hutton succeeds, 55, 98; premises moved to 5 Old Burlington Street, 98; in 1947 decide to close down in two years, 99; money set aside for Chinese, 99-100; in 1948 decide to remain in being, 100; Hungary emphasizes rightness of this, 100; possible future activity, 101; circular letter sent to refugees, 102; all documents now in Bodleian Library, 103; scholars express gratitude, 110-14; Fifth Report gives summary of present positions held, 122-3; lack of money never stopped essentials, 124; money less important than ideas and action, 125; memorandum on Formation of S.P.S.L., 129-32; meetings and lectures for Appeal of February 1939, 132-3; circular letter to scholars on S.P. Register, 134-6.

- Academic Assistance Fund at School of Economics, 1.
- Academic Institutions, Other: Bangalore Institute of Science, 120; Canberra University College, 69; Carnegie Institute of Technology, 120; City of Birmingham Technical College, 65; Courtauld Institute of Art, 20; Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 64; Free School of Political Science, Prague, 111; Huntingdon Grammar School, 97; Institute of International Education, U.S.A., 127; Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, Adelaide, 66; National Academy of Science, U.S.A., 29, 30; Ormond College, Melbourne, 121; Pittsburgh Institute of Technology, 120; Polish School of Medicine in Edinburgh, 92; Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, N.Y., 60 n.; Rhodesia and Nyasaland, Univ. Coll. of, xi, 6 n.; Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, N.Y., 123 n.; Scotch College, Montpelier, 55; Toronto Institute of Medieval Studies, 35; West Indies, Univ. Coll. of, 36; Woodbrooke College, Birmingham, 70.
- Adams, Dr. Walter, C.M.G., O.B.E., Secretary A.A.C., xi, 6, 13, 18, 19, 47, 51, 112, 127, 133.
- Albert Hall Meeting, 10.
- Alexander, Prof. Samuel, O.M., 3, 5.
- Anderson, Sir John, 56, 58.
- Angell, Sir Norman, 133.
- Appleget, Thomas B., 128.
- Arandora Star*, 58, 83.
- Aristotle, 64.
- Armenians, 18, 32.
- Arndt, Prof. Heinz W., xi, 69, 79-86.
- Austria: vii, 18, 27, 31, 32, 37, 38, 39, 53, 54, 63, 65, 66, 67, 96, 99, 104, 105, 106, 108, 113, 119, 134; Graz, 37; Vienna, 1, 35, 36, 43, 63, 97, 110, 117, 118.
- Austrians, 52, 55, 56, 58, 74, 81, 93, 95, 110.
- Baldwin, Stanley, Earl Baldwin of Bewdley, K.G., P.C., F.R.S., 8, 44, 46.
- Bank of England, 15, 70.
- Barclays Bank, 15.
- Barcroft, Sir Joseph, C.B.E., F.R.S., 133.
- Baxa, Jakob, 108.
- Baykov, Prof. Alexander, 110, 111.
- Beck, Guido, 106, 107.
- Belgium, 29, 56, 63, 66, 91, 104, 105.
- Bell, Rt. Rev. G. K. A., *see* Chichester, Bishop of.
- Bentwich, Prof. Norman, O.B.E., M.C., LL.D., 7 n., 21 n., 99.
- Bernhard Baron Trust, 15.
- Bevan, Edwyn, 48.
- Beveridge, the Lady, 2.
- Beveridge, Lord, author, viii, 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 17, 22, 25, 29, 30, 31, 34, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 51, 58, 70, 95, 98, 99, 102.
- Bielschowsky, Franz David, 106.
- Birmingham Small Arms Co., Ltd., 71.
- Bismarck, Otto, Prince von, 96.
- Blackett, Prof. P. M. S., F.R.S., 132.
- Blaschko, H. K. E., 112, 113.
- Bohr, Prof. Niels H. D., 29.
- Bonn, Max, 15.
- Born, Prof. Max, 65, 120, 121, 123.
- Bragg, Sir William H., O.M., P.R.S., 5, 133.
- Brand, Hon. R. H., 26.
- British Academy, 58, 64, 100, 101; President of, 26, 131; Fellows, 123.
- British Broadcasting Corporation, 10, 13, 35, 65, 92.
- British Commonwealth: 14, 91, 104, 105, 123; Australia, 38, 56, 58, 60, 77, 78, 105; Canada (*see also*), 17, 56, 58, 60, 69, 70, 79, 80, 86, 89, 90, 105, 117; India, 105, 120; Kenya, 105; New Zealand, 105; South Africa, 16; West Indies, 105.
- British Empire Cancer Campaign, 96.
- British Fascists, 19.
- Buckmaster, Viscount, 5.
- Burchardt, Frank, 56, 58.
- Burn, Mrs. Elspeth, xii.
- Cairns, Prof., 36.
- Callimachus, 119.
- Cambridge: Appointments Board, Lensfield House, 51; Cavendish Laboratory, 65; Engineering Laboratory, 64; Girton College, 36; Jesus College, 47; King's College, 51;

Cambridge (*cont.*):

- Newnham College, 65; Ridley Hall, 65; St. John's College, 47; Scott Institute for Polar Research, 51; Solar Physics Laboratory, 63; Strangeways Research Laboratory, 37, 60, 69; Trinity College, 47, 58, 120.
- Cameron Prize, 37.
- Canada: 17, 56, 58, 60, 69, 70, 79, 80, 86, 89, 90; Camp B, New Brunswick, 88, 89; Camp L, 89; Camp T, 87, 88; Fredericton, 88; Halifax, 82; Montreal, 36; Newfoundland, 83; Ottawa, 86; Quebec, 69, 70, 82, 84, 87, 88; St. John, Newfoundland, 87; St. Lawrence, 83, 84; Trois Rivières, 86.
- Canterbury, Archbishop of, xi, 26, 45, 46, 98, 131.
- Carnegie Corporation, 14, 95, 99.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 95, 99.
- Cazalet, Major P. V. F., J.P., 57.
- Cecil, Viscount of Chelwood, P.C., C.H., Q.C., D.C.L., LL.D., 5, 8.
- Central America: 91, 104, 105; Panama, 105.
- Chain, Prof. Ernst B., 123.
- Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. Sir J. Austen, 10.
- Chambers, Miss Enid, xi.
- Chichester, Bishop of, 76, 77.
- China, 92, 99, 100; Democratic League, 92.
- Churchill, Rt. Hon. Sir Winston L. S., K.G., P.C., O.M., C.H., F.R.S., 8, 17, 44, 55.
- Civil Honours, 37 n., 123.
- Clapham, Sir John, xi, 9 n., 34, 51, 62, 98.
- Clayton, Sir Christopher, C.B.E., 133.
- Coatman, Prof. John, C.I.E., M.A., 13.
- Cohn, Dr. Alfred, 127.
- Colm, Prof. Gerhard, 111.
- Communist persecution, vii, 21, 27, 28, 45, 93, 100, 130.
- Constable, W. G., M.A., D.C.L., Litt.D., F.S.A., 20.
- Corpus Platonicum, 64.
- Crawford and Balcarres, Earl of, K.T., G.B.E., D.L., 5, 8.
- Crewe, Marquess of, K.G., P.C., 8.
- Cullis, Prof. Winifred C., C.B.E., M.A., D.Sc., LL.D., 5, 133.
- Czechoslovakia: vii, xii, 18, 31, 32, 38, 54, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 96, 97, 104, 105, 134; Army, 122; Prague, 31, 43, 107.
- Czechs, 55, 92, 110.
- Dale, Sir Henry H., G.B.E., F.R.S., M.A., M.D., F.R.C.P., LL.D., 37, 133.
- Dalrymple, Alexander, 22.
- Danzig, 36 n.
- Davies, Griffith, 19.
- Dawson, Geoffrey, 13, 52.
- Day, Edmund, 13.
- Demuth, Dr. Fritz, 7, 30, 129.
- Denmark: 29, 38, 55, 105, 106, 107; Copenhagen, 36, 123 n.
- Deutsche Rundschau*, Ruhr-Verlag, Gelsenkirchen, 129.
- Dieckmann, Prof. Liselotte, 113.
- Don, The Very Rev. Dr. A. C., 45.
- Drury, Miss Betty, 7, 92 n., 126, 128.
- Duggan, Dr. Stephen, 6, 7, 92 n., 126, 127, 128.
- Dunera, S.S., 60, 61.
- Durham, Bishop of, 48, 49.
- Economic Journal*, 111.
- Einstein, Prof. Albert, D.Sc., 10, 13.
- Eire: 35, 38, 83, 94, 105; Dublin, 64.
- Emerson, Sir Herbert W., G.C.I.E., K.C.S.I., C.B.E., 33, 48, 53, 95.
- Epstein, F. T., 112.
- Epstein, Klaus, 112.
- Epstein, Mrs. F. T., 112.
- Estrick*, M.S., 69.
- Evans, Sir D. Emrys, M.A., B.Litt., 5.
- Eve, Prof. A. S., 2 n.
- Faraday, Michael, 96.
- Fascist persecution, vii, 27, 28, 57, 130.
- Fell, Dr. Honor B., 37.
- Filon, Prof. L. N. G., 22.
- Finland, 22.
- Finzi, Prof. Leo, 120, 121.
- Fisher, Rt. Hon. H. A. L., O.M., F.R.S., 5, 10.
- Flecker, Mrs. James Elroy, xii.
- Flexner, Dr. Simon, 30.

- Fraenkel, Prof. Eduard, F.B.A., M.A., D.Phil., 118.
 Fraenkel, Prof. G. S., 112.
 France: vii, 29, 45, 55, 56, 65, 66, 104, 105, 107, 119; Dunkirk, 71; Evian, 32, 123; Lyons, 106; Montpellier, 55; Paris, 55, 65.
 Friedlander, F. G., 58.
 Friedmann, Dr., 43, 44.
 Fry, Miss S. Margery, J.P., M.A., LL.D., D.C.L., 5, 55, 92, 99.
 Fürth, Prof. R., xii.
 Geneva Convention for Prisoners of War, 75.
 Germans, 52, 55, 56, 58, 74, 93, 95, 110.
 Germany: vii, 4, 11, 12, 18, 23, 24, 25, 27, 31, 32, 38, 39, 40, 44, 48, 49, 53, 54, 56, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 69, 84, 94, 96, 99, 104, 105, 106, 108, 109, 112, 113, 116, 118, 119, 120, 123, 127, 129, 130, 134; Berlin, viii, 7, 22, 35, 40, 41, 117, 123; Breslau, 36, 44, 69, 97, 123; Dresden, 11; Düsseldorf, 40; Frankfurt am Main, 1, 3, 97; Freiburg im Breisgau, 35, 37, 106, 123; Göttingen, 36; Gunzenhausen, law of, 12; Halle, 97; Hamburg, 15, 20, 35, 36, 115; Heidelberg, 37, 48-50, 69, 112, 123; Munich, 35, 118, 119; Offen- burg, 113; Saar, the, 32; Stuttgart, 108.
 Gibson, Prof. C. S., Honorary Secretary A.A.C., xi, 2n., 5, 6, 9; death of, xi; Royal Society proposes as Secretary, 3; first meeting of A.A.C., 6; letter to universities, 8; Exec. Cttee, 20; resigns as Hon. Sec., 97.
 Glücksmann, Dr., xi, 69, 86-90.
 Goebbels, 49.
 Greeks, 92.
 Greenwood, Prof. Major, xi, 3, 5, 6, 98.
 Guedalla, Philip, 132.
 'Habakkuk', 17.
 Hakluyt Society, 64.
 Haldane, Prof. J. B. S., F.R.S., D.Sc., 5, 112, 133.
 Halifax, Earl of, K.G., P.C., O.M., G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E., R.A., 8, 15, 44.
 Hall, Mr. and Mrs., 41, 42.
 Hamilton, Sir Ian, 48.
 Hanseatic Court of Appeal, 42.
 Harvey, T. Edmund, M.P., LL.D., 133.
 Hassan, xii.
 Hayman, Prof. W. K., 123.
Heidelberg Celebrations and the Universities of America, Viking Press, New York, 49n.
 Helleiner, Prof. K., F.M., 113.
 Heinemann, Messrs., xii.
 Henlein, Conrad, 92.
 Hertz, Friedrich, 58.
 Hill, Prof. A. V., C.H., O.B.E., F.R.S., LL.D., Sec. R.S.: Vice-President A.A.C., 6; Huxley Memorial Lecture, 20, 22, 23, 128; Chairman Executive Committee, A.A.C., xi, 98, 100; signs appeal, 5; money from U.S.A., 16; opposes Heidelberg celebrations, 49n.; speaks in House against internment, 57, 58, 59, 61; thanked for rescue, 111; Chairman appeal meeting, 133.
 Hill, George F., 5.
 Hitler, Adolf, vii, ix, 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 13, 18, 20, 21, 22, 27, 28, 29, 31, 36n., 39, 40, 45, 48, 55, 61, 69, 70, 91, 93, 94, 104, 108, 123, 124, 127, 128.
 Hoare, Sir Samuel, G.C.S.I., M.P., 133.
 Hodder & Stoughton Ltd., xii.
 Holdsworth, Sir William S., 5.
 Holland: 37, 56, 88, 91, 105; Amsterdam, 106; Hague, The, 7n.; Venlo, 122.
 Holtfreter, Dr. Johannes, 90.
 Hopkins, Sir Frederick Gowland, 2, 5, 48, 49n.
 Horder, Lord, G.C.V.O., M.D., B.Sc., D.C.L., F.R.C.P., 26, 131.
 Hotel Bristol, Berlin, 40.
 House of Commons, 44, 56, 57, 60, 61.
 Housman, A. E., 5.
 Houtermans, Prof. F. G., 28.
 Hughes, William, 75, 76.
 Hull, Cordell, 32.
 Hungarians, 14n., 93, 128.
 Hungary, 92, 97, 100, 104, 105, 124.
 Hutton, Prof. R. S., D.Sc., M.A., Hon. Sec. S.P.S.L., 98.
 Huxley, Dr. Julian S., F.R.S., M.A., D.Sc., 112.

- Huxley Memorial Lecture, 20, 22, 23, 24, 93.
Huxley, Thomas Henry, 23.
- Illuminated manuscripts, 96.
Imperial Chemical Industries, 15.
International Student Service, 10.
Internment, 21, 28, 29, 38, 55-62, 69-90.
Iraq, 39.
Ireland, *see* Eire.
Irvine, J. C., 5.
Isle of Man: 56, 59, 62, 69, 70, 73, 75, 77, 78, 81, 86, 89; Central Promenade Camp, 86; Douglas, 69, 70, 73, 74, 79, 80, 86, 89, 90; Mooragh, 73; Port Erin, 76, 78; Port St. Mary, 76, 78; Premier Private Hotel, 74.
Israel, 14, 46, 91, 104n., 105.
Italians, 52, 55, 56, 58, 96, 110.
Italy, vii, 18, 27, 32, 38, 39, 60, 65, 66, 67, 96, 104, 105, 108, 109, 119, 120, 121, 130, 134; Ministry of Agriculture, xii.
- Joachim, H. H., 15, 17.
Johnson, Dr. Alvin S., Ph.D., 111.
Jones, R. Huws, 41.
Jones, Tom, C.H., LL.D., 15.
- Kahle, Colonel, 79.
Katz, Prof. B., 111.
Kemp, Captain, 88.
Kenyon, Sir Frederic G., G.B.E., K.C.B., xi, 5, 6, 9n., 10, 49n.
Keynes, Lord, C.B., F.B.A., 5, 111, 112.
Kirov, Sergei, 28.
Kittredge, Tracy, 24.
Knopf, Messrs. Alfred A., Inc., xii.
Kogbetliantz, Prof. Ervand George, 119.
Kotschnig, Dr. Walter M., 127, 128.
Krebs, Prof. Sir Hans A., 123.
- Lathan, George, J.P., M.P., 57.
League of Nations, 45; High Commissioners, ix, 32, 33, 53, 127.
Lee, Sir Kenneth, 133.
Liepmann, Dr. Leo, xi, 56, 62, 69, 70-79.
Lindsay, Dr. A. D., C.B.E., 5, 133.
Lipmann, Prof. F. A., 123.
- London: Bedford College, 133; Birkbeck College, xii, 65, 133; Bloomsbury House, 41, 42; British Museum, 21, 37, 96; British Postgraduate Medical School, Hammersmith, 64; Dorchester Hotel, 46; Fishmongers Hall, 21; Guy's Hospital, 3; Imperial College, 97; Institute of Education, 133; London Museum, 35; London School of Economics, 1, 2, 6, 8, 23n., 47, 69, 124; Queen Mary College, 133; Royal Holloway College, 133; Sir John Cass College, 113; School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, 6; University College, 6, 22, 111, 112, 133; University Senate, 22; University site, 124; Warburg Institute, 15, 20, 64, 65n.; Westfield College, 64, 133; Woburn House, 42.
- Londonderry, Marquess of, 8.
Lytton, Earl of, 5.
- Mackail, J. W., 5.
Macmillan, Lord, 131.
Macmurray, Prof. John, M.A., 133.
Manchester Guardian, 76.
Mander, F., 15.
Mason, Max (Rockefeller Foundation), 34.
Mawer, Sir Allen, F.B.A., 5, 133.
Meston, Lord, 8.
Mexico, 63, 91.
Milne, Captain, 85.
Mises, Ludwig von, 1.
Mitchel, Sir Peter Chalmers, F.R.S., 133.
- Money: voted by L.S.E., 1; A.A.C. appeals, ix, 4, 8, 31, 32, 44, 45, 47, 48, 68; Appeal in U.S., 7; £10,000 raised by first A.A.C. meeting, 6; sources approached, 9, 10, 13-17; disappointing response, 15; cheering response, 15-17, 47-48, 97; from libel case, 16; desire for fellowships at £450 p.a., 20; difficulties, 24, 67-68, 124; A.A. Trust proposed, 25, and appealed for, 25-26; letter to *The Times*, 32; grants made, 34-38, 63-67, 96-97; government assistance, 48, 53-54, 67-68; confiscated from internees, 70, 79, 84, 86, 87, 89; Exchange Control and

Money (*cont.*):

- German post-war pensions, 94; pensions sought unsuccessfully here, 95; sum set aside for Chinese, 99-100; A.A.C. income exceeds expenditure, ix, 100; but Hungary intervenes, 100; quality of help appreciated, 111; important but not most important, 124-5.
- Morrison, Rt. Hon. Herbert, P.C., C.H., M.P., 56, 58.
- Mountbatten, Earl, 17.
- Mueller, Prof. Hugo, 43.
- Murray, Gilbert, O.M., 5, 10, 133.
- Murrow, E. R., 127.
- Nansen International Office, 33.
- Nantes, Edict of, viii.
- National Union of Teachers, 15.
- Naturalization, 69, 94, 95, 99.
- Nazi persecution, vii, ix, 1, 9, 11, 12, 20, 26, 27, 31, 33, 45, 53, 57, 61, 69, 82, 91, 92, 130.
- Nevinson, H. W., 48.
- Nobel Prize, 37, 123.
- Norway: 55, 105; Oslo, 63.
- Nuremberg Law, 24, 27, 45.
- Oxford: Acland Nursing Home, 47; All Souls College, 56; Balliol College, 47; Bodleian Library, x, 103, 119; Campion Hall, 118; Christ Church College, 120; Clarendon Press, 96; Dept. of Pharmacology, 112; Institute of Statistics, 64; Lincoln College, 37 n.; Merton College, 37; New College, 48; Nuffield Inst. of Medical Research, 121; The Queen's College, 119; Radcliffe Infirmary, 36 n.; St. John's College, 47; Somerville College, 64; University College, 5, 29, 34.
- Palestine, *see* Israel.
- Pallas Athene, 49.
- Pares, Sir Bernard, K.B.E., 133.
- Partridge, E. H., 133.
- Paterson, Alexander, 60.
- Peacock, Sir Edward Robert, 15.
- Peake, Osbert, 62.
- Percy, Lord Eustace, 5.
- Pevsner, Prof. Nikolaus, 120.
- Pfeiffer, Prof. Rudolf, 118, 119.
- Pfleiderer, Otto, 107.
- Pilgrim Trust, 15.
- Piper, Prof. Otto, 114.
- Poland, 18, 29, 65, 66, 67, 97, 104, 105, 109.
- Poles, 55, 92.
- Pontecorvo, Prof. Guido, xii.
- Pope, W. J., 5.
- Portugal, vii, 18, 25, 27, 28, 54, 66, 67, 92, 105, 106, 107, 130, 134.
- Portuguese, 92.
- Power and Influence*, Lord Beveridge, xii, 1 n., 2 n., 9, 23 n.
- Prochownik, 42.
- Pyke, Geoffrey, 17.
- Pykrete, 17.
- Quakers, *see* Society of Friends.
- Quantum Chemistry, Introduction to*, 29.
- Queen Mary*, 17.
- Rait, Robert S., 5.
- Rapkin, M. Louis, 29.
- Rathbone, Eleanor, 57, 58, 76.
- Rattlesnake*, H.M.S., 23.
- Rayleigh, Lord, 5.
- Reading, Marquess of, K.C., 15, 133.
- Reichenberger, Prof. R. G., 113.
- Reith, Sir John, 13.
- Relief organizations, Other: vii, viii; Central Committee for Refugees, 33; Central Fund for British Jewry, 15; Committee for the Protection of Persecuted Jewish Intellectuals, 45; Council for German Jewry, 29; Displaced Scholars Fund, 15; Emergency Cttee. in aid of displaced German Scholars, U.S.A., 6, 7, 14, 30, 31, 92, 126, 127, 129; Emergency Cttee. for displaced German Physicians, U.S.A., 127; German Refugees Assistance Fund, 10; Informal International Meeting, 29, 30; King George V Jubilee Trust, 24; Lord Mayor's Fund for Czechoslovakia, 31, 32; National Christian Appeal, 26; *Notgemeinschaft Deutscher Wissenschaftler im Ausland*, 7, 29, 35, 92, 107, 128-9; Refugee Professionals Committee, 10, 18, 19, 43; Society of Friends, German Emergency Cttee., 10; Stanley Baldwin Fund for Refugees, viii, ix, 31, 32, 48.

- Rescue and Achievement of Refugee Scholars*, by Norman Bentwich, Martinus Nijhoff, The Hague, 7n., 21n., 99.
- Rescue of Science and Learning, The*, by Stephen Duggan and Betty Drury, Macmillan Co., N.Y., 7, 92n., 126.
- Rhee, Hans, 56.
- Robbins, Prof. Lionel, 1.
- Robertson, Charles Grant, 5.
- Robinson, Robert, 5.
- Rockefeller Foundation, 13, 14, 24, 34, 92, 124, 126.
- Roosevelt, President F. D., 32, 111.
- Rosenberg, Alfred, 108.
- Rossel, Chevalier de, 22.
- Rothbarth, E., 122.
- Royal Irish Academy, 64.
- Royal Society: agrees A.A.C. appeal, 2, 3; President of, to administer A.A.F., 26, 131; suggests Prof. Gibson as Secretary of A.A.C., 3; gives rooms in Burlington House, 4, 5, 19, 91; Club, 22; definition of, 23; Fellows, 28, 123; foreign members, 37, 123; international meeting, 29; tribunal for interneers, 58, 59, 60; financial questions, 100; future co-operation, 101.
- Royal Society of Medicine, 58.
- Royden, Dame Maude, 10.
- Russia, *see* U.S.S.R.
- Russians, 28, 32.
- Rutherford, the Lady, 2.
- Rutherford, Lord: inception of A.A.C., 2; President A.A.C., ix, 2, 6, 25, 26, 45-46, 130; President S.P.S.L., ix, 2; launches appeal for A.A. Fund, 5; trustee, 131; death of, xi, 45; biography of, 9; speaks at Albert Hall, 10; writes to *The Times*, 13; writes to B. Baron Trust, 15; recommends Houtermans to U.S.S.R., 28.
- Rzoska, J., 113, 114.
- Sadler, Sir Michael S., 5.
- St. Mark's Gospel, 71.
- Salaman, Dr. R. N., 98.
- Salmon and Trout Association, 21.
- Samuel, Viscount, P.C., G.C.B., 99n., 133.
- Saxl, Dr. F., 15.
- Scandinavia, 91.
- Scholars, Arts: anthropologists, 66, 112; archaeologists, 39, 65, 66, 96, 109; architects, 18; archivists, 112, 113; art historians, 36, 37, 54, 63, 65, 66; classics, 64, 66, 113, 118; economists, 39, 43, 64, 66, 69, 107, 109, 110, 111, 113; education, 39, 66, 109; Egyptologists, 74; fine arts, 120; historians, 22, 64, 65, 66, 96; law teachers, 36, 37, 39, 43, 66; lawyers, 18, 65, 74, 96, 97, 115, 118; medievalists, 35; musicologists, 18, 37, 43, 63, 65, 66, 96; museum directors, 110; orientalist, 97; philologists, 35, 36, 38, 39, 63, 66, 96, 109, 113; philosophers, 36, 64, 66, 97; political scientists, 18, 111; sinologists, 66; sociologists, 66, 69, 79, 108; theologians, 39, 43, 114.
- Scholars, Science: anatomists, 60, 66, 69, 86, 110, 118; astronomers, 66, 97; bacteriologists, 63, 66; biologists, 37, 39, 60, 65, 66, 113; botanists, 106; chemists, 20, 36, 39, 65, 66, 109; dentists, 39; doctors, 18, 39, 60, 66, 110, 112, 114, 117; electricians, 109; endocrinologists, 96; engineers, 59, 60, 64, 66, 74; entomologists, 96; geneticists, xii; geologists, 35, 39; geometricians, 110; horticulturalists, 97; mathematicians, 29, 35, 39, 64, 65, 66, 96, 119, 123; neurologists, 36, 63, 66; obstetricians, 116, 117; orthopaedists, 108; otologists, 66; pathologists, 36, 66, 97, 116, 128; pediatricians, 64, 66, 117; pharmacologists, 37, 66; physicists, xii, 28, 29, 35, 39, 63, 64, 65, 66, 106, 109, 111, 115, 120; physiologists, 35, 66, 112; psychoanalysts, 117; psychologists, 66; radiologists, 63, 66, 106, 110, 117; surgeons, 110; zoologists, 21.
- Schubert, Franz, 63.
- Schurman, Dr. Jacob G., 49.
- Schuster, Arthur, F.R.S., 3, 5.
- Schwartz, Prof. Philip, 128, 129.
- Science, 'a common interest of mankind', 23, 128; 'has made globe too small for war', 128.

- Searle, Miss Nancy, 53.
Second World War, Winston Churchill, 17.
 Sherrington, C. S., 5.
 Sieff, Israel, 15, 46.
 Simon, Sir John, 13, 22.
 Simpson, Miss Esther, xi, xii, 6, 52, 58, 98.
 Simpson, Sir John Hope, K.B.E., 133.
 Sinclair, Sir Archibald (Lord Thurso), 44.
 Singer, Prof. Charles, 20.
 Singer, Rolf, 106.
 Skemp, J. B., 98.
 Smith, George Adam, 5.
 Smith, G. Elliot, 5.
 Smith, Harold D., 111.
Sobieski, 70, 87.
 Society for Protection of Science and Learning, *see* Academic Assistance Council.
 Society for Visiting Scientists, x, 98.
 Society of Friends, 61, 69, 70, 75;
 German Emergency Committee, 10.
 South America: 7, 91, 104, 105;
 Argentina, 38, 60, 105, 106, 107;
 Bolivia, 43; Brazil, 105, 106, 107,
 109; Buenos Aires, 36; Chile, 105;
 Columbia, 105; Cordoba, 106;
 Ecuador, 38, 105; Peru, 105;
 Venezuela, 105.
 Spain: vii, 18, 27, 28, 38, 39, 54, 63,
 65, 66, 67, 105, 106, 134; Basque,
 44, 56; Madrid, 35, 36, 106.
 Spaniards, 38, 55, 110.
 Speer-Klausner, Dr. Edith, viii, 40,
 41, 42.
 Stamp, Sir Josiah C., 5, 15, 48.
 Standard Oil Development Co., 119.
 Stark, W., 111, 112.
 Stöhr, Dr., 43.
Streptococcus viridans, 47.
 Sudan: 114; Khartoum, 113.
 Sweden, 29, 105, 107.
 Switzerland: 32, 91, 105, 106, 117;
 Zürich, 7, 128.
 Syria, 39.
 Tapestries, 96.
 Tate, Mrs. Mavis, J.P., M.P., 57.
 Tchernavin, Prof., 21.
 Teheran, 119.
 Temple, William, *see* Canterbury,
 Archbishop of.
They Found Refuge, by Norman
 Bentwich, Cresset Press, 99 n.
 Thomson, David Cleghorn, 47, 51, 52.
 Thomson, J. J., 5.
Times, *The*, 12, 32, 48, 49, 52, 76.
 Trevelyan, George M., 2, 5.
 Trevelyan, Mrs. Janet, 2.
Tribune, 69.
 Tuke, Favill, 15.
 Turkey: 104 n., 105, 106; Turkish
 Government, 128, 129; Ankara, 129.
 Uhl, Conrad, 40.
 Uhlmann, Erich, 106.
 Ulysses, 74.
 U.N.E.S.C.O., 64.
 United Kingdom: vii, viii, ix, 3, 6, 7,
 15, 17, 22, 31, 37, 39, 44, 48, 50,
 54, 55, 56, 57, 60, 61, 69, 89, 90,
 91, 92, 93, 94, 104, 105, 109, 110,
 112, 114, 116, 117, 120, 124, 128,
 130; Aberdeen, 17; Aldershot, 57;
 Belfast, 133; Birkenhead, 57; Bir-
 mingham, 10, 17, 20, 22, 65, 70,
 71, 132; Blackpool, 41; Bristol, 132;
 Bury St. Edmunds, 79; Cambridge,
 16, 17, 34, 51, 96, 98, 110, 120, 133
 (*see also* Cambridge); Chippenham,
 57; Droitwich, 47; Durham, 10, 17,
 98; Edinburgh, 21, 37, 98; Frome,
 57; Glamorgan, 56; Glasgow, 17,
 36, 65, 70, 87, 133; Hertfordshire,
 116; Hull, 133; Huyton Camp, 71,
 73, 79, 80; Lancashire, 97; Leeds,
 17, 133; Liverpool, 40, 69, 77, 79,
 80, 133; London, x, 10, 16, 21,
 34, 35, 51, 72, 73, 90, 98, 110, 114,
 117, 120 (*see also* London); Man-
 chester, 17, 110, 133; Newcastle
 under Lyme, 57; Newcastle upon
 Tyne, 10; Northumberland, 10, 98;
 Nottingham, 133; Onchan Camp,
 80; Oxford, 10, 13, 15, 16, 17, 20,
 30, 31, 34, 43, 51, 69, 70, 72, 78,
 94, 97, 110, 119, 133 (*see also*
 Oxford); Somerset, 5, 6; Southamp-
 ton, 133; Stoke Mandeville, Spinal
 Injuries Centre, 36 n.; Surrey, 47;
 Warminster, Budbrooke Barracks,
 70; Windsor Castle, 63.

- United Kingdom, government departments: Admiralty, 22, 23, 123; Air Ministry, 123; Aliens Advisory Committee, 70, 71; Anti-Locust Research, 123; Atomic Bomb Research, 122, 123; Board of Trade, 40; Central Committee for Refugees, 48, 52, 53, 95; Civil Defence, 123; Combined Operations, 123; Emergency Medical Service, 60; Enemy Aliens Tribunals, 52; Exchange Control, 94; Food Rationing Committee, 9; Foreign Office, 32, 123; Home Office, Aliens Dept., 13, 19, 41, 42, 77, 93, 94; Intelligence, Army, 54; labour exchanges, 40; Medical General Council, 19; Medical Research Council, 123; Ministry of Information, 123; Ministry of Supply, 123; National Assistance Board, 97; Pioneer Corps, Army, 54, 60, 65; Royal Air Force, 122; Royal Army Medical Corps, 54; Signals, Army, 54; Suffolk Regiment, 122; Treasury, 94; Unemployment Insurance Statutory Committee, 9; War Office, 74, 75, 79.
- United States of America: vii, xii, 6, 21, 30, 31, 35, 36, 37, 39, 41, 42, 43, 49, 64, 88, 91, 92, 104, 105, 106, 109, 110, 112, 116, 117, 119, 121, 126, 127, 128; Arizona, 117; Chicago, 117; Georgetown, 36; Library of Congress, Washington, 22n.; Louisville, 64; New York, 64, 117; Troy, 60n.; U.S. Air Force, 109; U.S. Navy Dept., 35; Warren State Hospital, Penn., 129; World Veterans Federation, 36n.
- Universities, Commonwealth: 50, 123; McGill, 36; Otago, 106; Queen's, Canada, 77; South Africa, 50; Toronto, 113.
- Universities, German: 1, 4, 26, 48, 49, 93, 114; Berlin, 28; Breslau, 29, 108; Frankfurt, 112, 116, 128; Göttingen, 120; Hanover, 29; Heidelberg, 48-50, 108, Rektor of, 49; Kiel, 111; Leipzig, 111; Munich, 118; Münster, 114.
- Universities, United Kingdom: 2, 8, 14, 20, 26, 34, 48-50, 123; Aberystwyth, 65n.; Belfast, 35; Birmingham, 65n., 110, 115; Bristol, 44, 115, 121; Cambridge, 96; Edinburgh, 65, 92, 120; Exeter, 65; Glasgow, xii; London, 65, 97, 111, 123; Manchester, 97, 98, 111; Oxford, 47; St. Andrews, 97; Wales, 5.
- Universities, United States: 7, 123, 126; California, 64, 65; Chicago, 36, 118; Columbia, 116, 119; Dumbarton Oaks, 36; Harvard, 64; Illinois, 36, 112; Kansas, 106, 107; Lehigh, 119; Maryland, 35; Pennsylvania, 113; Princeton, 114; Texas, 64; Washington, 111; Washington St. Louis, 113.
- Universities, Other: Berne, 29; Brussels, 63; Coimbra, 106; Czech University of Prague, 110; Erivan, 119; German University of Prague, 31, 106; Istanbul, 113, 128, 129; Naples, 120; Oslo, 63; Palestine, 14, 46; Polish University in Paris, 55; Porto, 106; Rio de Janeiro, 106; Tomsk, 29; Tucuman, 36.
- Universities Review*, 49n.
- Ursell, Miss I. J., 98.
- U.S.S.R.: vii, 18, 21, 25, 27, 28, 31, 45, 63, 66, 96, 104, 105, 106, 107, 110, 119, 130, 134; Bolshevik Revolution, 21, 127; Caspian Sea, 21; Leningrad, 28; Ljubianka jail, 29; Odessa, 106, 107; O.G.P.U., 21; White Sea Concentration Camp, 21.
- Valentin, Prof. Veit, 22.
- Vansittart, Sir Robert, 32.
- Vatican Library, 65.
- Versailles Treaty, 48.
- Virchow Society, N.Y., 117.
- Volterra, Prof. Enrico, 60.
- Wachsmann, K. P. L., 112.
- Wage and Price History*, 56, 69.
- Waley Cohen, Sir Robert, 15, 25.
- Wassermann, Ulrich, 90.
- Watson, Prof. D. M. S., 112.
- Wedgwood, Josiah, 57, 60, 61.
- Weil, Prof. Sigmund, 108.
- West, Miss Rebecca, C.B.E., 133.
- White, Graham, 57.
- Wilde, Prof., 79.

- Winterton, Earl, P.C., M.P., 133.
Wolmer, Viscount, 57.
Wood, H. G., 71.
Wool Industries Research Association, Leeds, 65.
World War I, 11, 108.
World War II, viii, ix, 9, 17, 18, 29, 31, 33, 34, 38, 39, 51, 53, 67, 69, 91, 98, 119, 122, 123.
York, Archbishop of, 46, 133.
Zangwill Memorial Fund, 64.
Zeissl, H. von, 43.
Ziegler, H. O., 122.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS, OXFORD
BY VIVIAN RIDLER
PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

